

VOLUME XLVI • NUMBER 4

December 1955

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF
ROMANCE LANGUAGES IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS • PUBLISHER

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

JUSTIN O'BRIEN, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

DINO BIGONGIARI

LEROY C. BREUNIG

ANGEL DEL RÍO

ENRICO DE' NEGRI

NATHAN EDELMAN

OTIS FELLOWS

DONALD M. FRAME

JEAN HYTIER

BERT M-P. LEEFMANS

LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM

MARIO A. PEI

JEANNE VARNEY PLEASANTS

JAMES F. SHEARER

NORMAN L. TORREY

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

DAVID I. GROSSVOGEL, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME XLVI

DECEMBER 1955

NUMBER 4

ARTICLES

- | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----|
| La Fontaine and La Rochefoucauld | PHILIP A. WADSWORTH | 241 |
| Rousseau on the Theatre and the Actors | ROBERT L. POLITZER | 250 |
| Claudel and Mallarmé | A. E. A. NAUGHTON | 258 |

REVIEWS

- | | |
|---|-----|
| Albert Béguin, <i>Pascal par lui-même</i> and Jean Demorest, <i>Dans Pascal: Essai en partant de son style</i> . [SISTER MARIE LOUISE, O.P.] | 275 |
| Marcel A. Ruff, <i>L'Esprit du mal et l'esthétique baudelairienne</i> and Marcel A. Ruff, <i>Baudelaire, l'homme et l'œuvre</i> . [MARGARET GILMAN] | 280 |

REVIEWS IN BRIEF

Les Miracles de Notre Dame par Gautier de Coinci, ed. V. Frederic Koenig [GRACE FRANK]; *The Oldest Version of the Twelfth-Century Poem La Venjance Notre Seigneur*, ed. Loyal A. T. Gryting [HARRY F. WILLIAMS]; Ernest Hoepffner, *Les Troubadours* [THOMAS G. BERGIN]; Alfonso Martinez de Toledo, *Arcipreste de Talavera*, ed. Mario Penna [AGAPITO REY]; Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Machiavelli AntiCristo* [FREDERIC C. LANE]; C. A. Mayer, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Clément Marot* [ISIDORE SILVER]; Fernand Desobry, *Ronsard poète de l'amour. Livre II: De Marie à Genevieve* [ISIDORE SILVER]; *Montesquieu (1689-1755)* [GEORGE R. HAVENS]; Montesquieu, *Lettres persanes*, ed. Antoine Adam [ALESSANDRO S. CRISAFULLI]; Paul Gazagne, *Marivaux par lui-même* [KENNETH N. MCKEE]; *New Letters of David Hume*, ed. Raymond Klibansky and Ernest C. Mossner, and Ernest Campbell Mossner, *The Life of David Hume* [PAUL H. MEYER]; George R. Havens, *The Age of Ideas: From Reaction to Revolution in Eighteenth-Century France* [N. L. T.]; Marcel Ian Morand, *Une Irlandaise libérale en France sous la Restauration: Lady Morgan, 1775-1859* [THOMAS R. PALFREY]; Victor Hugo: *Journal 1830-1848* [ELLIOTT M. GRANT]; Carlos Clavería, *Temas de Unamuno* [R. L. PREDMORE]; R.-L. Wagner, *Supplément bibliographique à l'Introduction à la linguistique française, 1947-1963* [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE]; Harry A. Deferari, *The Phonology of Italian, Spanish, and French* [FREDERICK JUNGEMANN]; Richard E. Knowles, *Victor-Émile Michelet, poète ésotérique* [OSCAR A. HAAC]; Robert Champigny, *Portrait of a Symbolist Hero: An Existential Study Based on the Work of Alain Fournier* [BLANCHE ADELLE PRICE]; Marguerite L. Drevet, *Bibliographie de la littérature française 1940-1946* [J. H.]; Albert Béguin, *Bernanos par lui-même* [W. M. FROHOCK]

Index..... 314

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Single copies \$1.25 (foreign \$1.35); \$5.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$5.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1955 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to Professor Justin O'Brien, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the *MLA Style-Sheet* which originally appeared in *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 3-31, and is available in reprints.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md., or 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.

LA FONTAINE AND LA ROCHEFOUCAULD*

By Philip A. Wadsworth

ALMOST everyone would agree that the highest attainment of La Fontaine, whether as poet or thinker or storyteller, is to be found in the five books of fables published in 1678 and 1679. These fables, i.e. the ones of books seven to eleven, surpass the earlier fables of 1668 in poetic virtuosity, in maturity of thought, and in depth of feeling. They are superior, also, to most of the fables of Book XII, a small and uneven collection which appeared in 1693, near the end of the poet's life. Thus the fables of 1678-79, with their personal accents and meditative qualities, would seem to be the most fruitful field for a comprehensive study of La Fontaine's intellectual and moral views.

No such study has ever been made. The truth is that scholars have barely begun, in the past 20 or 30 years, to remove the veil of anecdotes and legends which has always enveloped La Fontaine, and to perceive the real character of the poet and his work. Only one aspect of his philosophic outlook has been carefully investigated, and this is his theorizing on the souls of animals. An important article by Professor Jasinski, in 1933, demonstrated that Gassendi, by way of his disciple, Bernier, was a possible source for certain Epicurean tendencies in the fables of 1678-79, and certainly the main source for the poet's ideas on the composition and functioning of the animal brain.¹ The studies of Henri Busson have shown that La Fontaine read not only the writings of Bernier on this question, but also those of several doctors and scientists.² The argument about the type and degree of mental ability in animals, which of course stems from Montaigne and Descartes, was debated throughout the seventeenth century. It is good to know that La Fontaine kept in contact with the intellectual currents of his age and to have one more proof, if any were needed, that he was not always an idle daydreamer. But his views on "l'âme des bêtes" and on other scientific topics are developed in only half a dozen fables. This leaves a hundred others. The problem of defining his philosophy of life, or moral teaching, remains virtually unexplored.

The problem is not a simple one. It requires, first of all, finding the total meaning of each individual fable, that is, not merely the moral lesson

* This article, slightly abridged, was read as a paper at the 1954 meetings of the Modern Language Association.

1. "Sur la philosophie de La Fontaine dans les livres VII à XII des Fables," *Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie et d'Histoire Générale de la Civilisation*, n.s., I (1933), 316-30; II (1934), 218-42.

2. "La Fontaine et l'âme des bêtes," *RHL*, XLII (1935), 1-32. The disagreement between Jasinski and Busson on the principal sources of La Fontaine led to a further exchange of articles and letters between them: *RHL*, XLII (1935), 401-7, 631-36; XLIII (1936), 257-86, 317-20.

which it may set forth, but rather the whole sum of ideas and attitudes and feelings which the fable contains. Very often the moral lesson is some time-worn maxim which contributes little or nothing to the message of the fable as a whole. And the real message is not always easy to identify, for La Fontaine seldom asserts his opinions strongly. Understatement, irony, poetic overtones, degrees of seriousness and humor, sympathetic or unsympathetic attitudes shown toward certain characters—all these must be carefully weighed if the fable's meaning is to be fully understood. The poet's treatment of sources must also be considered: what he borrows from Aesop and other fabulists he may reaffirm with great conviction, or little conviction, or none at all. Then as one studies more and more fables one encounters the dilemma of inconsistency. La Fontaine was not a systematic thinker but a poet, and a very changeable poet who gave expression to a multitude of moods and feelings. Little wonder that he sometimes contradicts himself. Also, he had a very wide range of interests. Some of the principal themes in the fables of 1678-79 are science, politics, friendship, satire of women, hypocrisy, superstition, peace, providence, and the pursuit of wisdom. Thus the fables, as an ideological document, are unusually rich and challenging. It is to be hoped that scholars will take up the challenge and seek out a full interpretation of La Fontaine's ways of thought.

In this essay I shall try to make only a very small contribution to the problem. I want to discuss one theme among many in the fables of 1678-79, the theme of misanthropy. Clearly La Fontaine is not always misanthropic; he sometimes portrays men who are honest, or loyal, or temperate, or wise. And when he is pointing out man's vices he may speak indulgently or compassionately. But it is important to note that his attitude is often bitter or cynical. There are times when he enlarges the specific topic of his fable, possibly some frailty such as greed or vanity, and condemns man as an utterly base, immoral creature.

It is quite natural that he should exhibit this tendency of thought. He was given to fits of melancholy. He was a satirist by profession. And besides, the idea was in the air, everywhere around him. A similar awareness of man's weaknesses can be found in most writers and thinkers of the classical age—in Molière, in Racine, in La Bruyère, above all in Pascal and other disciples of Jansenism. But it is La Rochefoucauld who has the most in common with La Fontaine, and who is named in the fables as a source of inspiration. He may well have fortified the poet's gloomy views on mankind.

The two men probably met one another as early as 1659 or 1660, when La Fontaine was working as a sort of official poet and entertainer for Fouquet, the wealthy finance minister. The lavish hospitality of Fouquet attracted not only artists and writers but also representatives of the highest aristocracy, including La Rochefoucauld. From time to time the poet

offered some gallant compliments in verse to two very close friends of La Rochefoucauld, Mme de Sévigné and Mme de La Fayette, who also appeared occasionally at Fouquet's house. On the social scale La Fontaine was of course far inferior to La Rochefoucauld. There is no evidence to suggest that they knew one another intimately. But their paths sometimes crossed, they had common literary interests, and they soon came to admire one another greatly as men of letters.

In 1665 the retired *frondeur* published his first collection of maxims. Three years later, La Fontaine brought out the first six books of his fables. One of the fables of 1668, *L'Homme et son image* (I, 11), is an earnest and deferential tribute to La Rochefoucauld. *L'Homme et son image* tells of a very vain man who thinks himself handsomer than anyone else in the world and accuses mirrors of reflecting his image falsely. Unfortunately he keeps encountering mirrors everywhere he goes; men and women carry them around and they hang on the walls of every house. Then, like Molière's misanthrope, the man flees from society and goes to live in the wilderness. But even here there is a canal in which he sees his reflection, a beautiful canal which attracts him and repels him at the same time. At this point the story is suddenly generalized, turning into allegory. The poet tells us that the man stands for our soul, the mirrors stand for the faults of other people which reflect our own faults, and the canal, another mirror for our soul, is La Rochefoucauld's book of maxims:

Notre âme, c'est cet homme amoureux de lui-même;
Tant de miroirs, ce sont les sottises d'autrui,
Miroirs, de nos défauts les peintres légitimes;
Et quant au canal, c'est celui
Que chacun sait, le livre des *Maximes*.

No source has ever been found for the details of this ingenious allegory, but of course the main thought was inspired by La Rochefoucauld. The poet paid him a double compliment, not only his flattering reference to the maxims but also his development of La Rochefoucauld's most cherished idea, self-love or *amour-propre* as the great motivating force of mankind.³

La Rochefoucauld, on the other hand, never published anything in praise of La Fontaine. But there is evidence that he knew the fables well and held them in high esteem. In 1671 La Fontaine brought out a volume containing some new fables and certain other poems. One of his warm admirers, Mme de Sévigné, sent a copy of the book to her daughter and wrote her an enthusiastic letter about it: "N'avez-vous point trouvé jolies les cinq ou six fables de La Fontaine qui sont dans un des tomes que je vous ai envoyés? Nous en étions ravis l'autre jour chez M. de La Rochefoucauld;

3. La Fontaine was not aware of the great complexity and boldness of La Rochefoucauld's thinking; indeed his originality is only today becoming fully appreciated. See the recent studies by W. G. Moore, especially "La Rochefoucauld: une nouvelle anthropologie," *Revue des Sciences Humaines*, n.s., fasc. 72 (Oct.-Dec., 1953), 299-310.

nous apprîmes par cœur celle du *Singe et du chat*."⁴ Then she quotes at length from this fable and goes on to single out two others for special mention.

In the fable collection of 1678-79 La Fontaine again goes out of his way to express his admiration, even awe, for the author of the maxims. His *Discours à M. le duc de La Rochefoucauld* (X, 14) is not a fable but rather an essay or meditation on the behavior of human beings compared to that of animals. It concludes with a very eloquent tribute to La Rochefoucauld and an acknowledgment to him for having provided the subject matter of the poem:

Ainsi ce discours doit cesser.
Vous qui m'avez donné ce qu'il a de solide
Et dont la modestie égale la grandeur . . .

and so forth; then, 10 lines later:

Permettez-moi du moins d'apprendre à tout le monde
Que vous m'avez donné le sujet de ces vers.

What, exactly, is the subject which La Fontaine received from La Rochefoucauld? The *Discours* has a preamble stating that man very often acts as viciously as animals do, the reason being that all creatures, beasts and men alike, have their share of a material and universal soul substance:

. . . la nature
A mis dans chaque créature
Quelques grains d'une masse où puisent les esprits:
J'entends les esprits-corps et pétris de matière.

This is the theory, or part of it, which La Fontaine took from Gassendi and Bernier, and which he explained at length in his philosophical poem, the *Discours à Mme de La Sablière* (IX, 20). But in this instance he does not go on to say that man has mental and spiritual attributes which make him superior to animals. Here his mood is a dark one and he is concerned, like La Rochefoucauld, with the baseness of mankind. To illustrate his thought he sketches a hunting scene in which some rabbits take flight at the sound of a gun but soon reappear and expose themselves to danger again. He points out that these rabbits are just like men, for men refuse to profit from experience. Then he gives another example: the selfishness of dogs and men. Just as a dog will chase away some other dog who comes near his food, so do courtiers, rulers, people of every condition, and especially authors, he adds, attack savagely any newcomer who might possibly compete with them or endanger their special privileges.

At first glance it seems strange that La Rochefoucauld should have given the poet these parallels between beasts and men. The maxims do

4. Letter of 29 April 1671.

not suggest that La Rochefoucauld ever took any interest in the behavior of animals. Such an interest does appear, however, in one of his *Réflexions diverses*, the series of 19 essays which he never published and which, for the most part, remained undiscovered for almost 200 years after his death. The *Réflexions diverses* differ greatly from the maxims and reveal a little-known aspect of La Rochefoucauld's genius. Unfinished and unpolished, they are more relaxed than the maxims, more natural in manner, and usually mellowed and less arbitrary. While the maxims tend to be rather abstract and theoretical, the *Réflexions* make use of many concrete examples and details. In his maxims he was trying to state moral laws, the general principles governing human conduct. But in his *Réflexions* he is often more interested in the exception than in the rule, and shows a keen awareness of the variability of life.

The eleventh of his *Réflexions diverses* is entitled *Du rapport des hommes avec les animaux*.⁵ It begins by drawing a parallel between the many species of animals and the many types of human beings:

Il y a autant de diverses espèces d'hommes qu'il y a de diverses espèces d'animaux, et les hommes sont, à l'égard des autres hommes, ce que les différentes espèces d'animaux sont entre elles et à l'égard les unes des autres. Combien y a-t-il d'hommes qui vivent du sang et de la vie des innocents: les uns comme des tigres, toujours farouches et toujours cruels, d'autres comme des lions, en gardant quelque apparence de générosité. . . .

The resemblance between men and the various species of animals is a commonplace idea; it has occurred to countless people across the ages. It is the foundation on which fable literature has always rested. One will recall that Balzac expounds the theory at some length in the *Avant-propos* which he wrote for *La Comédie humaine*. As for La Rochefoucauld, he has few kind words to say, either about men or about animals. He does mention the beauty of certain birds, the usefulness of cattle and horses, and the industriousness of ants and bees, but he exhibits great horror for many members of the animal kingdom:

. . . il y a des araignées, des mouches, des punaises et des puces, qui sont toujours incommodes et insupportables; il y a des crapauds, qui font horreur et qui n'ont que du venin; il y a des hiboux, qui craignent la lumière. . . . Combien . . . de pourceaux, qui vivent dans la crapule et dans l'ordure; de canards privés, qui trahissent leurs semblables, et les attirent dans les filets; de corbeaux et de vautours, qui ne vivent que de pourriture et de corps morts!

These and many other animals are cited—whether for their ugliness or their cruelty or their duplicity or their ignorance—and always with the implication that the same traits are duplicated in human beings. As La Rochefoucauld declares in his final sentence, "Toutes ces qualités se trouvent dans l'homme. . . ."

5. *Œuvres complètes*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris: NRF, 1935), pp. 373-75.

The date of this *Réflexion* cannot be established but it would seem to fall somewhere in the period 1668 to 1678, i.e. somewhere between the two main collections of fables by La Fontaine. A curious interplay of literary influences can be glimpsed. When La Rochefoucauld describes certain animals, such as the fox "dont le métier est de tromper," or peacocks "qui déplaisent par leur chant," or grasshoppers "qui passent leur vie à chanter," or ants "dont la prévoyance et l'économie soulagent tous leurs besoins," he stresses the same characteristics which La Fontaine had emphasized and dramatized in his fables of 1668. Probably these fables came to La Rochefoucauld's mind when he meditated on the similarities between animals and men; perhaps they even gave him his idea. Then, in the course of his essay, he brought in other observations which in turn gave inspiration to La Fontaine.

We can only guess whether La Fontaine saw La Rochefoucauld's manuscript or whether the two men perhaps discussed these matters together and exchanged ideas. Since the poet always gave himself a free hand with his sources, it is quite natural to find that there is almost no textual resemblance between the *Réflexion* and the *Discours à La Rochefoucauld*. The *Réflexion* does make a brief comment on rabbits—"qui s'épouvantent et se rassurent en un moment"—which indeed states one theme which the poet utilizes and develops at length. But what of the dogs? La Rochefoucauld devotes several sentences to different breeds of dogs, but only one remark—"ils détruisent leur espèce"—has anything in common with the dogs as described by La Fontaine. Of course the poet's principal borrowing is not a matter of words and phrases, but rather the thought which runs through the whole *Réflexion*, the thought that men behave as badly as animals. It would be difficult to identify and measure all the sources for such an idea, or to weigh the influence of La Rochefoucauld. The same view, or traces of it, can be found in some of La Fontaine's earliest fables. Then, in 1678-79, not only in his *Discours à La Rochefoucauld* but in other poems as well, it becomes an important preoccupation. All that can be said with sureness is that La Rochefoucauld helped, in some degree, to strengthen and crystallize this tendency of the poet's thought.

The misanthropy of La Fontaine displays itself most prominently in fables where he is concerned with man's treatment of animals. He always takes his stand on the animals' side and condemns man as unjust or cruel. In *L'Homme et la couleuvre* (X, 1) the question is raised whether the man or the snake is more ungrateful and tyrannical. The poet calls the snake an "animal pervers" but with an ironic comment which hints at the intention of the fable:

... l'animal pervers
(C'est le serpent que je veux dire,
Et non l'homme: on pourrait aisément s'y tromper).

The dispute is taken to a cow for arbitration, then to an ox, then to a tree. Each one agrees with the snake and accuses the man of needless cruelty toward the animals which serve him. This theme also is foreshadowed in La Rochefoucauld, who had exclaimed in his *Réflexion*: "Combien de chevaux, qu'on emploie à tant d'usages, et qu'on abandonne quand ils ne servent plus; combien de bœufs, qui travaillent toute leur vie, pour enrichir celui qui leur impose le joug. . . ." But La Fontaine develops the thought more forcefully and in greater detail. He endows his animal characters, and the tree also, with real intelligence and dignity; each one makes an eloquent, well-reasoned speech. But the man sputters quite irrationally, refuses to believe the evidence against him, and finally kills the snake in a fit of temper. This slanted portrayal of character, this sympathy for mistreated creatures, this deep feeling for man's unjust nature—all this is new with La Fontaine and cannot be found in any of his sources. He seems to be speaking from his heart.

Several other fables reveal much the same attitude. In *Rien de trop* (IX, 11) the poet points out the gluttony and cruelty of both animals and men. But men are the worst offenders: "De tous les animaux l'homme a le plus de pente / A se porter dedans l'excès." The wolf in *Le Loup et les bergers* (X, 5) is "un loup rempli d'humanité." Tired of being hated and hunted he resolves to suppress his natural instincts and not to eat other animals. But then he happens to see some shepherds roasting a sheep for their dinner. Why should he try to be more humane than man? He decides that he may as well go on raiding the flocks and exposing himself to the hatred and violence of mankind. Or again, in *La Perdrix et les coqs* (X, 7), the gentle partridge suffers many cuts and scratches when she is cooped up with some quarrelsome roosters. She recognizes that the roosters are not at fault; they are behaving as roosters should. Her comment has become proverbial: "Il est des naturels de coqs et de perdrix." But what of man's nature? She places the blame for her mistreatment squarely on her master:

Il nous prend avec des tonnelles,
Nous loge avec des coqs, et nous coupe les ailes:
C'est de l'homme qu'il faut se plaindre seulement.

Thus, on many occasions, La Fontaine showed that he was shocked by man's inhumanity to lesser creatures. He believed that man ought to have more dignity and tolerance than animals do, but that in fact he often has less.

This may seem to go contrary to the poet's ideas from Gassendi on "l'âme des bêtes." The difficulty is soon resolved, however, if one distinguishes clearly between mentality and morality. Gassendi's theories, which La Fontaine accepted and believed in, deal mainly with mental ability, with the primitive, childlike intelligence of animals and the superior intelligence of man. But La Fontaine was not so much a philosopher as an observer of

life. Moreover, he kept in touch not only with scientific theories but also with the pessimistic views of La Rochefoucauld and other commentators on human behavior. Speaking as a student of philosophy he sometimes discussed man's rational powers. Speaking as a moralist he often criticized human conduct as vicious and comparable to that of the lower animals. The two levels of his thought can be seen side by side in that laborious and over-intellectual poem, *Le Quinquina* (1681).⁶ At one point he says that primitive man learned some of his first lessons by observing the exploits of animals. But the animals were merely obeying their instincts, while man was making use of his mind:

Et qui sait si dans maint ouvrage
L'instinct des animaux, précepteur des humains,
N'a point d'abord guidé notre esprit et nos mains?

This is in keeping with La Fontaine's scientific views. But then he goes on to discuss the excesses and vices of men, and offers this comment: "L'homme se porte en tout avecque violence / A l'exemple des animaux." Here is his moral view, which he shares with La Rochefoucauld: the worst behavior of animals has somehow been imitated or acquired by mankind.

Of course La Fontaine does not always make forthright comparisons between man and beast. But the comparison is implied in all his animal characters, since they have human traits. Quite often he makes a cynical demonstration of strong creatures, i.e. strong men, who triumph over weaker ones, as in *Les Animaux malades de la peste* (VII, 1). Or again he may point out, and very bitterly, the advantages derived from practicing flattery or hypocrisy, for example in *Les Obsèques de la lionne* (VIII, 14). Or he may dwell on a single character, whether an animal or a human being, as typical of all mankind. Nothing could be more pessimistic than *Le Paysan du Danube* (XI, 7), in which a virtuous, heroic person surrenders to bribery. The lesson of the fable is that all men are corruptible.

These opinions are a far cry from the notions of prudence, moderation, and common sense, which manuals of literary history so often attribute to La Fontaine. He did not always teach the simple, homely virtues. On the other hand, his teaching was not immoral, in spite of the arguments of Rousseau and Lamartine. He reveals himself, at least in the fables of 1678-79, as a very earnest student of human nature, but not always a cheerful one. His observations and meditations, even when related in a most amusing fashion, often give special emphasis to the weaknesses and crimes of mankind. As Giraudoux once noted, the fables of La Fontaine have much in common with his tales in verse, not only in their storytelling art but also in their cynical outlook on life.⁷ His fables may urge

6. *Œuvres diverses*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris: NRF, 1942), pp. 60-75. The passages quoted are on pages 72-73 and 75.

7. *Les Cinq Tentations de La Fontaine* (Paris: Grasset, 1938), p. 215.

moderation or rectitude, but as goals which man seldom tries to reach. For he was inclined to conceive of man as dishonest, as immoderate, as cruel, as an animal like other animals. La Fontaine is less gouty, less bitter than La Rochefoucauld; his modes of thought are more devious and harder to classify. But like La Rochefoucauld, and partly because of him, he shows a strong streak of misanthropy in many of his fables. Both authors have given the world a powerful indictment of mankind.

University of Illinois

ROUSSEAU ON THE THEATRE AND THE ACTORS

By Robert L. Politzer

ROUSSEAU's famous paradoxical attack on the theatre and the actors in the *Lettre à d'Alembert* has been the source of endless discussion and investigation. Albert Schinz's *Etat présent* reveals the main general trends which the discussion of the *Lettre à d'Alembert* seems to follow: Rousseau as a continuator of the Christian moralistic condemnation of the theatre; Rousseau and the *querelle du théâtre*; Bossuet and Rousseau; did Rousseau really condemn the theatre? etc.¹ One problem, if not actually overlooked, is at least not sufficiently emphasized in the whole discussion: just what is the meaning of the *Lettre à d'Alembert* from the point of view of Rousseau's own aesthetic theory? After all, the theatre and the actors are literary or aesthetic facts. And while the nature of the *Lettre à d'Alembert* makes the related moral problem predominate, we can expect that Rousseau's aesthetic theory should have influenced his thought in a work which deals with one of the major arts.

The slogan and catchword which predominates in Rousseau's writings on aesthetics—and in most aesthetic discussion at the middle of the century—is, of course, *imitation*: "La musique dramatique ou théâtrale concourt à l'imitation, ainsi que la poésie et la peinture: c'est à ce principe commun que se rapportent tous les beaux-arts, comme l'a montré M. Le Batteux."² But imitation is almost by definition inferior to that which is imitated. Imitation as a doctrine of art must ultimately rely on a philosophy which makes it possible to assert that the imitation of the artist is not an inferior copy of reality, but the copy of an ultimate model of truth or beauty which lies beyond reality itself. Imitation, as Professor Nolte states so very aptly, "is not an aesthetic but a metaphysical concept . . . as such it is aesthetically justified only in the pattern of Platonic philosophy."³ Even the above-mentioned Batteux had trouble in justifying the principle of imitation and succeeded only by stating that he was not really advocating imitation of nature, but of "la belle nature," not of "le vrai qui est" but "le vrai qui peut être."⁴ To a Rousseau, the champion of real nature who asserted that "tous les vrais modèles du goût sont dans la nature"

1. Albert Schinz, *Etat présent des travaux sur J. J. Rousseau* (Paris: 1941), pp. 191-93.

2. J. J. Rousseau, *Dictionnaire de musique, Œuvres complètes de J. J. Rousseau* (Paris: Hachette, 1905), VII, 140. Other quotations from Rousseau will be taken from this same edition, and the reference given parenthetically in the main body of the article.

3. Fred O. Nolte, "Imitation as an Aesthetic Norm," *Studies in Honor of Frederick W. Shipley* (St. Louis, 1942), p. 301.

4. Charles Batteux, *Les Beaux Arts réduits à un même principe* (Paris, 1747; first edition 1741), p. 27.

(*Emile*, IV; Hachette II, 314) imitation of nature could not furnish a really satisfactory aesthetic principle.

So Rousseau actually abandons a theory of imitation, or, as Fräsßdorf in an excellent article on Rousseau's aesthetics has pointed out, gives the expression "imitation" a new meaning: language or music "imitates" the passions or emotions of the individual—Rousseau's "imitation" is really self-expression.⁵ The idea that self-expression was the historical source of language and its aesthetic manifestation had already been uttered by Condillac.⁶ Rousseau in his *Essai sur l'origine des langues* accepted Condillac's idea and developed it further: "Que la première invention de la parole ne vient pas des besoins, mais des passions" is the title of Chapter II of his *Essai* (Hachette I, 373), and as a result, "d'abord on ne parla qu'er. poésie" (Hachette I, 374).

In the aesthetics of self-expression truth and beauty can of course be easily reconciled—a fact which is important to remember because of Rousseau's preoccupation with moral problems in the *Lettre à d'Alembert*. The source of morality in Rousseau's system is *pitié*, the extension of self-preservation which forces the individual to put himself in the place of another individual of the same species.⁷ The individual artist who reveals himself truthfully—Rousseau starts his *Confessions* by stating "je me suis montré tel que je fus" (Hachette VIII, 1)—performs simultaneously an aesthetic and a moral action, for he not only expresses himself, he also gives another individual the chance to put himself in his place, to perform a moral act inspired by pity. Chapter XV of Rousseau's *Essai* (entitled "Que nos plus vives sensations agissent souvent par des impressions morales") contains a very interesting example of his aesthetic and moral thought: "L'aboïement d'un chien en attire un autre. Si mon chat m'entend imiter un miaulement, à l'instant je le vois attentif, inquiet, agité. S'aperçoit-il que c'est moi qui contrefais la voix de son semblable, il se rassied et reste en repos." It seems that Rousseau's cat is affected only by reality and truth—not by the imitation.

But the principle so beautifully illustrated by Rousseau's cat poses a difficult problem when it is applied to the theatre and the actors: for if

5. Walter Fräsßdorf, "Der Begriff der Nachahmung (*Imitation*) in der Ästhetik J. J. Rousseau's," *Archiv f. d. Gesch. d. Philos.*, XXXV (1923), 117: "Der Begriff der Nachahmung hat bei Rousseau wie in der gesamten Ästhetik seiner Zeit den Rank eines ästhetischen Grundprinzips. Er versteht darunter—seine Erörterung fast ausschliesslich auf die Musik beschränkend—die (verstärkende!) Darstellung der in der 'Sprachmelodie' (accent) der Sprache bereits in Erscheinung tretenden lautlichen Äusserungen der Gefühlsprozesse . . ."

6. Etienne Bounot de Condillac, *Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines* (Paris: Colin, 1924; first edition Paris, 1746), especially pp. 148 ff.: Chapter VIII, "De l'origine de la poésie."

7. For Rousseau's views on *pitié* and *amour-de-soi* see especially the *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité*: "... de cette qualité (e.g. *pitié*) découlent toutes les vertus sociales . . . La commisération sera d'autant plus énergique que l'animal spectateur s'identifiera plus intimement avec l'animal souffrant" (Hachette I, 99).

art is truth and self-expression, how can we account for the theatre (or in a larger sense, for all kinds of fiction) and for the actor?

Rousseau accuses the theatre, itself an imitation or falsification of reality, of producing only the imitation of real emotions. The pity produced by the theatre is a pseudo-emotion, undermining the real, genuine pity which is the source of all moral action: "J'entends dire que la tragédie mène à la pitié par la terreur, soit. Mais quelle est cette pitié? Une émotion passagère et vaine qui ne dure pas plus que l'illusion qui l'a produite" (*Lettre à d'Alembert*, Hachette I, 193).

But how can art or fiction produce real emotions? How can truth and fiction be combined in any meaningful sense? Two radically different answers are possible and, as we shall see, Rousseau thought of both. (1) The characters of fiction can assume an objective reality of their own and become independent from the author. They, so to speak, cease to be fiction, and become real human beings expressing their emotions. (2) The characters of fiction are merely mouthpieces of the author. The author expresses himself through the characters, thus establishing a real contact between his audience or readers and his own genuine emotions.

Rousseau's attitude toward the problem of fiction is expressed most clearly in his own major fictional work, *La Nouvelle Héloïse*. The entire conception of the work (and of course also of his models like *Clarissa Harlowe*) shows the impact of the aesthetics of self-expression upon fiction. The main characters express themselves in letters, while Rousseau acts apparently only as the editor. More specifically, the second preface of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* is largely devoted to the problem of the independent reality of the character. It is a dialogue which plays almost constantly with precisely that idea: "N—: 'Si tout cela n'est que fiction vous avez fait un mauvais livre, mais dites que ces deux femmes ont existé, et je relis ce recueil tous les ans jusqu'à la fin de ma vie.' R—: 'Eh, qu'importe qu'elles aient existé?' " (Hachette IV, 17).

In other words, the characters can become so real that the fact that they are invention can, from the reader's point of view, become irrelevant. Rousseau assures us that his characters are unlike those of fiction, they are "real" people, expressing their "real" emotions: "Croyez-vous que les gens vraiment passionnés aient ces manières de parler vives, faites, colorées que vous admirez dans vos drames et dans vos romans? Non, la passion, pleine d'elle-même s'exprime avec plus d'abondance que de force, elle ne songe même pas à persuader; elle ne soupçonne pas qu'on puisse douter d'elle. Quand elle dit ce qu'elle sent, c'est moins pour l'exposer aux autres que pour se soulager" (*Seconde Préface*, Hachette IV, 6).

At the same time, the idea of the author's identifying himself with the character is clearly expressed in the footnote at the end of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*: "Je ne saurais concevoir quel plaisir on peut prendre à s'imaginer

et composer le personnage d'un scélérat, à se mettre à sa place, tandis qu'on le représente, à lui prêter l'éclat le plus imposant" (Hachette V, 78).

The phrase "se mettre à sa place" is, of course, the key to Rousseau's criticism and his own doctrine: if the author can identify himself with a character, just as the reader can, then a real bridge, the all-important genuine contact between real emotions, is re-established.

The possibility of self-identification with the character and also that of creating an independent reality are the main critical tools applied by Rousseau in the *Lettre à d'Alembert*; thus in the discussion of tragedy it is obvious that quite often Rousseau prefers to attack Voltaire rather than Racine. Aside from purely personal motives, there is also a real literary reason behind this, for Racine lives up to at least one of Rousseau's criteria, independence of character: "Mais chez Racine tout est sentiment; il a su faire parler chacun pour soi, et c'est en cela qu'il est vraiment unique parmi les auteurs dramatiques de sa nation" (*La Nouvelle Héloïse*, footnote to *Partie II, Lettre XVII*; Hachette IV, 174).

The final criticism with which Rousseau dismisses the problem of tragedy is that all events and characters contained therein are so distant that any real self-identification is impossible: "Heureusement la tragédie, telle qu'elle existe, est si loin de nous, elle nous présente des êtres si gigantesques, si boursoufflés, si chimériques, que l'exemple de leurs vices n'est guère plus contagieux que celui de leurs vertus n'est utile" (*Lettre à d'Alembert*, Hachette I, 199).

In the discussion of comedy the same criteria crop up again. In the literature of the famous Rousseau-Molière controversy, the point has often been made that Rousseau identified himself with the character of Alceste. The important point here seems to be that in trying to do so Rousseau merely followed the precepts of his own critical doctrine. Faguet in his famous *Rousseau contre Molière* discussed at length the problem of Alceste's character and tried to show that Alceste as described by Molière was indeed "true to life." Yet in the entire disputation, it is perhaps not the most important problem to decide which of the two was right. What should be underlined is the difference in criteria. For Rousseau it is simply not enough that Alceste may be true to life. Molière's Alceste may be *vraisemblable*, but Rousseau, in the last analysis, wants him to be *vrai*. He must be a real person, have a reality independent from the author: "Le caractère du misanthrope n'est pas à la disposition du poète, il est déterminé par la nature de sa passion dominante . . ." (*Lettre à d'Alembert*, Hachette I, 203).

And so Rousseau's aesthetic-moral criteria of the possibility of self-identification or of independence of character, opposed as they seem, lead in practice to a plea for greater realism in fiction and to the introduction of

8. Emile Faguet, *Rousseau contre Molière* (Paris, 1910), *passim*.

contemporary subject matter. Professor Von der Mühl was, of course, quite right when he saw in Rousseau an ally or predecessor of the "réformateurs du théâtre" in the later eighteenth century.⁹

In the aesthetics of self-expression, imitation is replaced by reality—*vraisemblance* becomes sincerity. We have seen the impact of this doctrine upon fiction, but where does this doctrine leave the actor? Can his role as an artist be explained with the criteria of sincerity and self-expression? This problem had to be faced not only by Rousseau, but by all those to whom sincerity and self-expression had become aesthetic criteria. Diderot wrestled with this particular problem throughout most of his career, abandoning an early theory of "self-identification" for a theory of a *modèle idéal* which is mentally created by the artist and which he imitates in the process of artistic production.¹⁰ Diderot could find a solution to the problem of the actor because he was able to reconcile a theory of imitation not only with a non-platonic philosophy but also with an aesthetic doctrine of self-expression. The artist by a pragmatic process of trial and error creates his own *modèle idéal* in which he expresses himself and which he imitates in his own work of art.¹¹ For Diderot then, the *vrai* on the stage was "la conformité de signes extérieurs de la voix, de la figure, du mouvement de l'action, du discours, en un mot de toutes les parties du jeu avec un modèle idéal ou donné par le poète ou imaginé de tête par l'auteur."¹² But, of course, Diderot's *modèle idéal* is not a direct, obvious, self-expression of passion as it was understood by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who (unlike Diderot) would never have admitted that "les grands poètes, les grands acteurs . . . sont les êtres les moins sensibles."¹³

The fact seems to be that Rousseau, as a result of his strict and uncompromising application of the theory of self-expression and sincerity, was not able to find an aesthetic-moral formula for the actor. In the *Lettre à d'Alembert* he excuses the really great actor, somewhat vaguely, on the grounds of sincerity: "Quand on se sent un vrai talent, qui peut résister à son attrait?" (Hachette I, 210). In *La Nouvelle Héloïse* he tries to save the actor by the same method we saw him apply to any kind of fiction; the rift between reality and fiction is bridged by fiction's becoming reality: he reproaches the characters of a play when "quelque agités qu'ils puissent être, ils songent toujours plus au public qu'à eux-mêmes," and he reprimands the spectators for not considering fiction as truth: "L'acteur pour eux est toujours l'acteur, jamais le personnage qu'il représente" (Hachette IV, 174).

9. E. Von der Mühl, "Rousseau et les réformateurs du théâtre," *MLN*, LV (1940), 161-69.

10. For a brief discussion of this problem in Diderot's works see Wladyslaw Folkierski, *Entre le classicisme et le romantisme* (Paris, 1925), pp. 486-95.

11. For the description of the creation of the *modèle idéal* see *Œuvres complètes de Diderot*, ed. Assézat (Paris, 1875), *Introduction to the Salon of 1767*, Vol. XI, 9-11, and *Paradoxe sur les comédiens*, Vol. VIII, 390-91.

12. Diderot, *Paradoxe*, *op. cit.*, VIII, 349-50.

13. *Ibid.* p. 368.

Rousseau's advice to the actor as well as to the public is thus ultimately that they should fuse fiction and reality. Interestingly enough, this fusion or perhaps confusion of fiction, art and reality is precisely characteristic of Rousseau's own approach to the entire problem of the theatre. The confusion is already implied in the very title of the *Lettre à d'Alembert sur les spectacles* which refers to both the theatre (fiction) and patriotic demonstrations and public games (reality) as *spectacles*. In the *Lettre* itself Rousseau proceeds from a thesis that the theatre not only adapts itself to the mores of a given society, but also tends to reinforce these very same mores.¹⁴ As a matter of fact, once this point is established, it is almost impossible to distinguish in the *Lettre* whether Rousseau is attacking the French theatre or French society; for all the evils he sees on the French stage are replicas of evils of French society, be they the disproportionate "unnatural" role of women, the lack of respect for old age, sexual promiscuity, etc. In passages from *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, this fusion or confusion of theatre and reality is quite clearly expressed: "Ainsi de quelques sens qu'on envisage les choses, tout n'est ici que babil, jargon, propos sans conséquence. Sur la scène comme dans le monde, on a beau écouter ce qui se dit on n'apprend rien de ce qui se fait, et qu'a-t-on besoin d'apprendre? Si tôt qu'un homme parle, s'informe-t-on de sa conduite?" (Hachette IV, 174). "En général, il y a beaucoup de discours et peu d'action sur la scène française: peut-être est-ce qu'en effet le François parle encore plus qu'il n'agit, ou du moins qu'il donne un bien plus grand prix à ce qu'on dit qu'à ce qu'on fait . . ." (Hachette IV, 173).

Is Rousseau protesting against lack of action on the stage, or lack of action in society? The answer is, of course, that he discusses both stage and society simultaneously, that he refers now to fiction now to reality without real differentiation, with little or no transition.

Rousseau defines the profession of the actor as "l'art de se contrefaire, de revêtir un autre caractère que le sien, de paroître différent de ce qu'on est" (*Lettre à d'Alembert*, Hachette I, 231). But not being oneself, abandoning one's real character, is precisely the thing with which Rousseau repeatedly reproaches man in society. In the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* he accuses man corrupted by society of being an actor: "Qu'il seroit doux de vivre parmi nous, si la contenance extérieure étoit toujours l'image des dispositions du cœur" (Hachette I, 4). In the *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* he elaborates further on how society and *amour-propre* transform man into an actor: "Il fallut pour son avantage se montrer autre que ce qu'on étoit en effet. Etre et paroître devinrent deux choses tout à fait différentes" (Hachette I, 112-13). "... L'homme sociable toujours hors de lui, ne sait vivre que dans l'opinion des autres et c'est pour ainsi dire de leur seul jugement qu'il tire le sentiment de sa propre

14. "Qu'on n'attribue donc pas au théâtre le pouvoir de changer des sentiments ni des mœurs qu'il ne peut suivre et embellir" (Hachette I, 189); "... l'effet général du spectacle est de renforcer le caractère national" (Hachette I, 190).

existence.¹⁵ . . . Il n'est pas de mon sujet de montrer comment d'une telle disposition naît tant d'indifférences pour le bien et le mal, avec de si beaux discours de morale; comment tout se réduisant aux apparences, tout devient factice et joué, honneur, amitié, vertu et souvent jusqu'aux vices mêmes, dont on trouve enfin le secret de se glorifier" (Hachette I, 126). Artificiality, pretense, discourses on morality instead of action: all this is the evil that Rousseau sees in society. It is at the same time the evil he sees in the theatre and the actor.

The theme which uses the actor and artificiality as the symbol of the evil of social man can be found abundantly in Rousseau's later works also: in *La Nouvelle Héloïse* St. Preux declares that one of the characteristics of the big city is that "nul homme n'ose être lui-même" (Hachette IV, 171), and that "c'est le premier inconvénient des grandes villes que les hommes y deviennent autres de ce qu'ils sont, et que la société leur donne pour ainsi dire un être différent du leur" (Hachette IV, 188). Emile's education has the beneficial result that he is "l'homme du monde qui sait le moins se déguiser" (*Emile* V; Hachette II, 386). He is thus quite different from the average man in society because "l'homme du monde est tout entier dans son masque" (*Emile* IV; Hachette II, 200). Examples of this theme "man, the actor" could easily be multiplied. To J.-J. Rousseau who so proudly proclaimed "je me suis montré tel que je fus" the great vice of man was to be an actor, the great sin of society was artificiality. To him the actor on the stage was primarily the symbol of social man.

Rousseau's discussion of the theatre, especially the *Lettre à d'Alembert*, should thus be interpreted as being simultaneously a discussion of art and society, and of fiction and reality in which the theatre and the actor become the symbols of society and social man. The *spectacle*, which Rousseau condemns, is a symbol for society at its worst: on the stage there is man the actor, not being himself, but "performing" because of his desire for applause, driven by his *amour-propre*; in the audience there is man, the passive spectator, approving of justice and morality, but without having to act upon his moral theory, without genuine involvement. In the same way the *spectacle* of the public festival described at the end of the *Lettre à d'Alembert* becomes a symbol for society at its best: there is no longer any difference between man the spectator and man the actor; artificiality has been eliminated. Pseudo-pity has been replaced by genuine emotion, by real and true self-identification: "Donnez les spectateurs en spectacle; rendez-les acteurs eux-mêmes; faites que chacun se voie et s'aime dans les autres à fin que tous en soient mieux unis" (Hachette I, 263).

Let us conclude with a general reflection on the meaning of Rousseau's attitude toward the theatre, his confusion of art and reality. The theory

15. Note that Rousseau also levies against the characters of the theatre the accusation that "ils songent toujours plus au public qu'à eux-mêmes" (Hachette IV, 174).

of the arts—especially those involving language—as having their origin in self-expression was formulated first, as is well known, at the beginning of the eighteenth century in Italy by Vico, and later, probably independently, in France by Condillac.¹⁶ Tremendously important as both Vico and Condillac are, it is perhaps well to bear in mind that their theories as such would have had little effect upon the course of literature if J.-J. Rousseau with his radical, uncompromising subjectivism had not provided the application and living example of the theory. Schinz, in his *Etat présent*, showed quite clearly that during the course of the history of Rousseau scholarship the concept of Rousseau, the great innovator, was slowly undermined by a current which sees in Rousseau an imitator, a man who lacked originality.¹⁷ Either of these concepts, it seems, misses the real meaning of the man who ended his first great work, his manifesto, by making the distinction between *dire* and *faire*,¹⁸ a distinction which recurs throughout his entire work. Rousseau's greatness lay not in theorizing, but in the practical application of theory. This is, then, also the meaning of the *Lettre à d'Alembert* and of Rousseau's attitude toward the actor: Rousseau makes an uncompromising, practical application of the aesthetic doctrine of self-expression to the problem of the theatre and the actor.¹⁹ Even Rousseau's confusion of reality and fiction, of artificiality and art, are inherent in this theory of self-expression, for if we hold with Croce that all language is aesthetic and that the source of all language is self-expression,²⁰ then it is indeed difficult to draw the line between art and reality, and the artificiality of art becomes a difficult, if not insoluble, problem.

Harvard University

16. For the discussion of Condillac's aesthetics see T. M. Mustoxidi, *Histoire de l'esthétique française 1700-1900* (Paris, 1920), pp. 50 ff. Vico as the originator of the theory of the aesthetics of expression has, of course, been discussed by B. Croce in various works: see for instance *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale*, 3rd. ed. (Bari, 1908), Chapter V.

17. See Schinz, *op. cit.*, pp. 388 ff.

18. "Tâchons de mettre entre eux et nous cette distinction glorieuse qu'on remarquoit jadis entre deux grands peuples; que l'un savoit bien dire, et l'autre bien faire" (Hachette I, 20).

19. Amilda A. Pons, who has studied Rousseau's theatrical works and his attitude toward the theatre, has come to a conclusion somewhat similar to the one advanced here, namely that Rousseau's extreme subjectivism prevented him from becoming a successful dramatic author: "Sortir de soi-même, observer d'un œil curieux les hommes . . . en un mot se 'dépersonnaliser' sans effort et continuellement, telle est la qualité fondamentale de l'auteur dramatique. Or Rousseau est un 'subjectif.' Il étudie, il sonde, il analyse son moi, auquel il rapporte le monde entier." *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et le théâtre*, (Genève, 1906), p. 70.

20. "Vi è poesia senza prosa, ma non prosa senza poesia. L'espressione è, infatti, la prima affermazione dell'attività umana." Croce, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32.

CLAUDEL AND MALLARME

By A. E. A. Naughton

IT HAS sometimes been asserted that Paul Claudel developed in a sort of literary vacuum, or at least in isolation from the contagion of Parisian salons and cafés and their discussions, in the safety of distant French consulates in the Orient and in America. H. Dérioux declares without qualification: "Claudel s'est développé dans l'isolement, sans liens avec la littérature de son temps, sans contacts avec elle."¹ The poet himself seems to give some weight and authority to this view of spontaneous generation when he writes to Jacques Madaule: "Aucun auteur français n'a eu sur moi la moindre influence."² To accept unquestioningly such a statement would be naïve or at best would overlook its truculence as an affirmation of Claudel's own independence and his desire not to be confused with mere *gens de lettres*. It is an expression of his fierce pride and also, perhaps, his fear, never completely banished, that God and Mammon are irreconcilable. Such a declaration is another form of a literary iconoclasm so compulsive and strong in Claudel that a critic has remarked that he devastated French literature *à coups d'ostensoir*. In recent years Claudel has modified considerably such sweeping claims of immunity to the literary virus. "J'ai toujours été," he admits to Jean Amrouche in a radio interview, "un grand lecteur, un mangeur de papier imprimé. Je sais au contraire combien je dois à la lecture et à l'étude."³ Note should be made of the words "study" and "reading." Claudel was not a casual reader but one whose attitude was reflective and whose critical powers were highly developed if often highly personal as well. The published radio interviews show what Claudel's critical writings had already revealed: an alert and receptive mind. His remarks on Shakespeare, whose plays he read and studied in the original as a young man, bear witness to his keen understanding, and it is not difficult to see that *Tête d'or* betrays more than a superficial acquaintance with the author of *King Lear*. In the same way his study and translation of Aeschylus were to leave their mark upon Claudel's conception of dramatic poetry. The enumeration of his favorite authors—Euripides, Virgil, Dante,

1. Henri Dérioux, *La Poésie française contemporaine* (Paris, 1945), p. 117.

2. Jacques Madaule, *Le Génie de Paul Claudel* (Paris, 1933), p. 11.

3. "Entretiens avec Jean Amrouche" in *La Nouvelle NRF*, 1^{er} juin 1953, p. 961.

However Claudel continues to believe that the danger of over-exposure to literary influences is serious. He points out in the same interview from which the quotation is taken what he regards the main risk to be: "Seulement j'ai le sentiment que tout être constitue sa personnalité à part, et que rien, absolument rien ne peut remplacer; et que même une influence extérieure—je ne dis pas constamment, mais à un certain moment—peut être positivement nuisible et vous égarer. Il doit y avoir une espèce de sentiment farouche, d'intrépidité personnelle, pour guider le poète en germe et lui permettre de distinguer ce qui lui est bon, ce qui lui est mauvais et de repousser avec horreur ce qui est délétère pour lui."

les impériaux as he calls them, the Latin lyrics, Bossuet, Dostoyevski, Rimbaud and later in China, Hardy and Conrad—must dispel the idea that the sole objects of his meditations were the weighty volumes of Saint Thomas' two *Summas*. In spite of his vehement denials to the contrary, Claudél was a man of books even as he was to become in a very exalted sense and almost à son corps défendant, a man of letters.

It is the purpose of the following pages to examine briefly Claudél's relationship and contacts with Mallarmé and to indicate the manner and degree in which Claudél was attentive and receptive to the example and *obiter dicta* of the older poet, his respect for the man and admiration for the nobility of Mallarmé's quest for 'une poésie pure.' Mindful of Thibaudet's warning that the concept of influence in literary matters is far from being clear, one may nevertheless suggest that the affinity between Claudél and Mallarmé partook of the mystery of friendship as described by Montaigne or of Pascal's search for God ("Tu ne me chercherais pas si tu ne me possédais"). A transfusion of ideas, like plasma, is most successful between identical types. But the circumstances of their contacts are also of special importance because they coincided with Claudél's formative years and the religious crisis he was experiencing.

Claudél's first visits to Mallarmé's *mardis* seem to have taken place shortly after his conversion (December 25, 1886). Jacques Madaule mentions an essay Claudél sent to Mallarmé in 1887 and in which the latter "trouve un certain intérêt."⁴ Normally such a gesture of homage on the part of a young poet to a distinguished Master would be regarded as a polite convention or else attributed to some ulterior motive. In this case a deeper significance may be seen in the fact that Claudél does not appear to have offered similar homage to any other writer. Romain Rolland, who was Claudél's classmate at Louis-le-Grand before entering the Ecole Normale Supérieure, made the following entry in his diary (1889): "Claudél est du cénacle de Mallarmé et de Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, mais il dit franchement qu'il ne les admire que pour la forme; il fait bon marché de leur métaphysique."⁵ The ambiguity of this observation is removed later on: "Claudél lui-même qui se dit passionné pour Mallarmé et Villiers n'admire en eux que la forme." This is not admiration *pro forma*, but a distinction drawn between the charm and subtlety of Mallarmé's conversation and his empty Platonism. When in later years Claudél recalls his visits, his judgment tends to replace youthful enthusiasm. To Ernest Friche he writes: "J'ai fréquenté chez Mallarmé pendant huit ans, entre 1886-1895, mais n'y allais que de temps en temps; je venais occupé par un travail intérieur

4. *Le Théâtre de Paul Claudél* (Paris: Pléiade, 1951) I, xxxiv. Quotations from the plays are from this edition henceforth referred to as Pléiade. Other quotations are from *Les Œuvres complètes de Paul Claudél* (in the course of publication by the Librairie Gallimard, Paris, now sole copyright holder of Claudél's writings) unless otherwise indicated.

5. Romain Rolland, *Le Cloître de la rue d'Ulm* (Paris, 1952), p. 281.

tout à fait étranger à l'atmosphère mallarméenne."⁶ This "travail intérieur" was, of course, his endeavor to clarify all the philosophical implications of his religious faith (it is frequently forgotten that the *coup de grâce* which Claudel received at the Christmas service at Notre Dame was the beginning and not the end of a spiritual crisis which actually lasted over a period of four years). But it would be a mistake to imagine, as Claudel would have us, that his preoccupations were totally foreign or unrelated in spirit to Mallarmé's metaphysics and that his admiration was reserved for the esthete, for the prince of poets. The distinction that Rolland reports at the time between Mallarmé the metaphysician, "le reclus du cabinet des signes" and Mallarmé the esthetician was to be, oddly enough, reversed when Claudel came to reject the esthetics of the Word and recalled with gratitude the importance for him of Mallarmé's heuristic interrogation: "Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire?"

In 1893 Claudel is appointed to his first consular office in New York; in 1894 he is *gérant* of the French consulate in Boston. After a brief visit to France he leaves for his China post in June 1895 not to return again until 1900. Before leaving, however, Claudel writes from Villeneuve-sur-Fère (25 March 1895) to Mallarmé to express his double debt to the poet and the man:

Il est probable que pour moi le premier élément de votre phrase en est la syntaxe ou le dessein qui des mots divers qu'elle rapproche ou distancie, de manière à les dépouiller d'une part inutile de leur sens ou à les rehausser d'un éclat étrange, constitue ce que vous appelez excellemment un terme . . . Laissez-moi me féliciter de la fortune que j'ai eue de rencontrer au début de ma carrière littéraire votre conversation, votre exemple et amitié.⁷

In the same letter Claudel enters into a discussion of Mallarmé's Oxford lecture published under the title of *La Musique et les Lettres* (1895):

Le voisinage de cette folle (la musique qui ne sait ce qu'elle dit) a été pour tant d'écrivains d'aujourd'hui si pernicieux qu'il est agréable de voir quelqu'un au nom de la parole articulée lui fixer sa limite avec autorité. Si la Musique et la Poésie sont, en effet, identiques dans leur principe, qui est le même besoin d'un bruit intérieur à proférer et dans leur fin, qui est la représentation d'un état de

6. Ernest Friche, *Etudes claudéliennes* (Porrentruy, 1943) in the "Préface." In "La Catastrophe d'Igitur" (*Positions et Propositions*, I, 204) Claudel speaks of his "rarest conversations" with Mallarmé who in turn mentions that Claudel came to his apartment "trois ou quatre fois." Cf. H. Mondor, *Vie de Mallarmé* (Paris, 1941), p. 709.

7. Mondor, *op. cit.*, p. 710. In "La Catastrophe d'Igitur" Claudel evokes the apartment on the rue de Rome: "La lampe, la glace, la console, les rideaux, l'horloge, la bibliothèque, les dés, sans oublier, dans sa vacuité transparente, 'Cette goutte du Néant qui manquait à la mer,' le fameux flacon ou ptyx. Tout le mobilier étoffé et étouffant de l'ère victorienne, aussi la suspension à gaz avec son petit sifflement si bien décrite et recommandée dans un des numéros de la *Dernière Mode*, où un nouveau rêveur, le cigare aux doigts, vient succéder à celui du Corbeau. Au dehors, il n'y a rien que la nuit sans espérance." *Positions et Propositions*, I, 200.

félicité fictif, le poète affirme et explique là où l'autre va, comme quelqu'un qui cherche, criant; l'un jouit, l'autre possède, sa prérogative étant de donner à toutes choses un nom. Nul esprit plus que vous n'était fondé à revendiquer ce haut droit des lettres dans lesquelles vous exercez la magistrature: l'intelligence.⁸

A single adulatory letter, particularly exchanged between fellow men of letters, is not very strong proof of influence—*testis unus testis nullus*—and one might suppose that the Parisian mandarin was forgotten by Claudel during his long residence abroad. Yet despite his official duties, absorbed in spiritual exercises and devoting at the most one hour a day to literary composition Claudel finds time to renew the expression of his admiration in a letter dated 23 November 1896 from Fou-Tchéou ("le timbre et l'autographe vont ravir Geneviève, car c'est de Paul Claudel"):

Votre phrase où dans l'aérien contre-poids des ablatifs absolus et des incidentes la proposition principale n'existe plus que du fait de son absence, se maintient dans une sorte d'équilibre et me rappelle ces desseins japonais où la figure n'est dessinée que par son blanc, et n'est que le geste résumé qu'elle trace. Etant donné un grand écrivain, il fallait qu'il fût Parisien pour inventer un pareil style et s'en servir . . . Je dis cela avec humilité, conscient de ma propre patauderie. J'ai envoyé à la *Revue de Paris*, qui en a publié quelques-unes, des images de Chine. C'est de la littérature descriptive . . . piètre genre.⁹

These letters show sufficiently that Claudel, like so many others, had fallen under the spell of Mallarmé whose charm of manner, disinterestedness and lofty spirituality were calculated to win a "garçon hargneux" seeking escape from the prison of materialism. Like Malherbe, that other "pédagogue en cheveux gris," Mallarmé taught that writing was a noble and serious calling. The letters show, along with Claudel's attentiveness to the characteristics of Mallarmé style, his tendency to *tirer à lui*, to attribute to others his own aspirations and theories, as when he describes the function of the poet as that of affirming, explaining and possessing all things in order to give them a name. For Mallarmé the "divine transposition" meant something quite different from what it meant to Claudel. Admiring, indeed emulative in matters of style—the degree to which Claudel has assimilated Mallarmé's manner almost amounts to a pastiche—the young poet-diplomat is far from being a docile disciple when moral principles are involved. He writes to Mallarmé in another letter (26 July 1897):

Le dessin en projection de votre phrase et la voltige suprême de votre pensée est toujours pour moi un sujet de ravissement et matière à un ébahissement infini. Je

8. Mondor, *op. cit.*, pp. 709–10. Lecture and letter considerably attenuate, not to say refute, Valéry's statement that the main effort of the Symbolists was a desire to "reprendre à la Musique leur bien." Claudel in this letter seems to be expressing himself under the influence of Thomistic theory; it is not the famous dichotomy of *Anima* and *Animus*.

9. Mondor, *op. cit.*, pp. 745–46. The "images" were "Pagode," "Ville," "la Nuit," "Jardins," collected in *Connaissance de l'Est*.

me propose—pour moi—de vous écrire un jour ou l'autre à mon aise à propos de certains sujets qui me tiennent à cœur comme: *Catholicisme* ou *Arthur Rimbaud* (envers qui vous me semblez injuste). Depuis le coup de foudre initial dont m'a frappé la livraison de la *Vogue* où je lus pour la première fois les *Illuminations*, je puis dire que je dois à Rimbaud tout ce que je suis intellectuellement et moralement, et il y a peu d'exemples d'un si intime hymen de deux esprits . . .¹⁰

Whatever "Parnassian" views Mallarmé may have held about Christianity, his tact would have prevented him from entering into a debate with Claudel on the subject. The long tug-of-war waged over Rimbaud's religious beliefs, if he had any, probably did not interest Mallarmé in the least. On the other hand one may imagine that Mallarmé was pleased with the flattering analyses of his prose style, with the clever introduction of the words *absence* and *blanc* so characteristic of the hermetical world of his own mind. Claudel's reference to his own compositions (the pieces that were to make up the volume he called *Connaissance de l'Est*) as belonging to "le genre descriptif" is both over-modest and misleading. They are more like the prose-poems that Mallarmé himself wrote during his Baudelairian period and Claudel's intention in composing them, partly indicated in the cryptic title itself, was in the nature of exercises in discovering meaning in the strange new world of the Orient. In reading them Jacques Rivière was struck by the syntactical similarities between the two writers. In a letter to Alain-Fournier, Rivière declares: "En lisant à la fois Mallarmé et Claudel, je me convaincs de mon idée d'une influence de l'un sur l'autre."¹¹

To conclude this rapid account of the contacts between the two poets, and to bring it up to date, a recent "testimonial" issued by Claudel will illustrate the shift in emphasis which has taken place. Elaborating on a statement by Jean Amrouche that *L'Art poétique* was essentially an attempt to understand the meaning of Creation and man's place in it, Claudel goes on to say:

10. Mondor, *op. cit.*, p. 778. "Catholicisme" appeared in *La Revue Blanche* (Feb. 1895); "Arthur Rimbaud" in the same publication in Sept. 1896, reprinted in *Divagations*. Mallarmé collaborated in the number of *La Vogue* in which Claudel first read Rimbaud's *Illuminations* (v. *Les Œuvres complètes de Mallarmé*, Paris: Pléiade, 1945, p. 1580). One reads among other things in "Catholicisme": "... inaptitude de gens à percevoir leur néant sinon comme la faim misère profane, hors l'accompagnement du tonnerre d'orgues absolu de la Mort" (*Œuvres*, pp. 390-91). The article on Rimbaud is condescending in tone. Mallarmé rejects the possibility of any influence exerted by the *poète maudit*. Indeed one senses that Mallarmé, in his middle-class conformity, was rather shocked by Rimbaud's stormy career. He concludes his article with prudence which, if it had been imitated by others, would have spared M. Etienne twenty years of labor: "Ordonner, en fragments intelligibles et probables, pour la traduire, la vie d'autrui, est tout juste impertinent: il ne me reste que de pousser à ses limites ce genre de méfait" (*Œuvres*, p. 517). *A bon entendeur* . . . The warning to future myth-makers went unheeded however, and by Claudel himself first of all.

11. Jacques Rivière et Alain-Fournier, *Correspondance* (Paris, 1926) II, 168, 192, and *passim*.

Eh bien, au fond, tout cela, c'est la convergence de la grande leçon que m'a donnée Mallarmé, à peu près la seule que j'ai retenue de son enseignement, puisque Mallarmé est surtout un enseigneur, un professeur . . .¹²

It is less the theorist of poetic expression Claudel now remembers than the metaphysician's interrogative attitude before the phenomenal world. This change in Claudel's point of view is no doubt explained by the fact that in the interval he had created his own style. The same shift is clearly noticeable in the study he wrote on Mallarmé in 1926, "La Catastrophe d'Igitur." In this essay Claudel pays generous tribute to the originality of Mallarmé's "enormous" discovery but his admiration is coupled with a sad pity that Mallarmé was, for lack of a unifying concept of the universe, unable to utilize that discovery and was thus reduced to impotence and silence. If Mallarmé was the first, as Claudel claims, "qui se soit placé devant l'extérieur, non pas comme devant un spectacle, ou comme un thème à devoirs français, avec cette question: *Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire?*"¹³ he left his own question unanswered.

For Claudel, however, the question must have some answer other than sterile silence, and he seeks the solution to one of the central problems of perennial philosophic enquiry throughout his various works. Indeed, in a sense, it is possible to classify his writings around this basic preoccupation. He is concerned with the ontological aspect in *L'Art poétique* and in *Connaissance de l'Est*. His plays, from *Tête d'or* to *Le Soulier de satin* are explorations of the meaning of human existence. The attitude of trying to grasp intentions informs his interpretation of art (*Introduction à la peinture hollandaise*) even as it gives rise to his hermeneutics, his bestiaries and lapidaries and his interest in ideographs.¹⁴ In more recent years Claudel took pains to furnish an exegesis of the meaning of his own works. But as a young poet, he chiefly admired in Mallarmé "l'ouvrier du mot," the artist who stood out among those "qui ont le mieux parlé de leur art et qui en ont déterminé avec le plus de profondeur les ressorts et les moyens."¹⁵

12. "Entretiens," in *La Nouvelle NRF*, 1^{er} juin 1953, p. 979. See also Claudel's *Positions et Propositions*, I, 26: "Ainsi concurremment avec la peinture, la poésie ouvrit chaque année une espèce de Salon pittoresque et anecdotique, jusqu'au moment où un professeur, Stéphane Mallarmé, qui nous a gardés tous pendant de longues années à son cours du soir, fit une trouvaille. On pouvait fabriquer et 'étudier' cet objet prosodique qu'il nous était loisible de saisir entre les doigts, avec ses lignes simplifiées, non moins que la figure d'un livre scientifique, non plus seulement comme un bibelot, mais comme un document et un texte et le mot de la Création."

13. *Positions et Propositions*, I, 203.

14. Cf. Mallarmé's "Graphologie" (*Œuvres*, p. 878). Claudel's reports to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which were greatly admired according to Mme Sainte-Marie Perrin, were written in a different style if one may judge from *Sous le signe du dragon*, notwithstanding a contrary opinion attributed by Roger Peyrefitte to one of his characters in *Les Ambassades*.

15. *Positions et Propositions*, I, 198.

Evidence of this admiration is furnished by a sonnet which Claudel contributed in 1897 to an album of poems presented to Mallarmé by a group of friends. The first quatrain and one line of the first tercet are as follows:

Celui-là seul saura sourire, s'il a plu
 A la Muse elle-même, institutrice et Mère,
 De former, lui ouvrant la Lettre et la Grammaire,
 Sa lèvre au vers exact et au mot absolu.

 Gardien pur d'un or fixe où l'aboi vague insulte.¹⁶

If imitation is the purest form of admiration the sincerity of this tribute is beyond doubt. It is equally clear that the tribute is not addressed to Mallarmé the philosopher but to the poet.

There appear then two ways in which Mallarmé aroused in the young Claudel a deep response: first, through his conception of the function of language; and second, through his peculiar way of looking at things. Claudel rejects in the beginning Mallarmé's sterile Platonism which does not "compose" because, as he explained later, "le contingent n'arrivera jamais à faire de l'absolu."¹⁷ The impatient young idealist, *assoiffé d'absolu* and searching for eternal verities, could not be satisfied with a system which he regarded as too limited. But Claudel retains and exploits the possibilities of the methodological interrogation somewhat in the way Descartes used the principle of doubt. Once the solution was found (in *L'Art poétique*) what had been for Mallarmé an impasse became for Claudel a *passé-partout* unlocking the secret doors of the universe;¹⁸ the *démon de l'analogie* is exorcized and transformed into a universal analogy after the manner of Saint Bonaventure. Mallarmé's dream of making the world into a beautiful book becomes an actual possibility to be realized.¹⁹ The Word that "composes" (in the Valéryan sense as well) can be uttered. The force of this preoccupation is manifest throughout Claudel's work, as has been indicated, but particularly during the period when he was writing *L'Art poétique* and his early poems. Mallarmé's famous question is turned into a kind of philosophical play on words: "*veut dire*" has not only the translatable value of "meaning" but "striving to express." The poet catechizes nature and is catechized by it. Man was created in order to give praise, and all other things on the face of the earth were created for man's sake, that is, so that he may say what they mean. The poet speaks with great exultation in *Cinq Grandes Odes*:

16. Claudel, *Œuvres*, I, 13.

17. *Positions et Propositions*, I, 202.

18. As Mallarmé admitted to Louis Le Cardonnell: "Mon art est une impasse" (Quoted by John Charpentier in *Le Symbolisme* [1927], p. 61).

19. In Mallarmé's "Réponse à l'enquête de Jules Huret" (*Œuvres*, p. 872). "Au fond, voyez-vous, le monde est fait pour aboutir à un beau livre." This remark has provoked a good deal of amused irony but it is not difficult to see how such an attitude would have impressed Claudel.

J'ai trouvé le secret; je sais parler, si je veux
je saurai vous dire
Cela que chaque chose veut dire.²⁰

Whether the poet has communicated his secret is a matter for each reader to decide for himself.

More complex and delicate, however, is the problem of demonstrating the influence of Mallarmé's "form," using the word, in the sense that Romain Rolland seems to imply, to include a whole system of language and expression. First of all it would be hard to imagine two artists more dissimilar in temperament. Mallarmé's mind is analytical; he is a detached contemplator of the Idea for whom "le Réel est vil." He conceives that the aim of poetry is to suggest, since it is impossible to name, the mysterious essence that lies behind phenomena. This view leads him to create a style highly condensed and purely intellectual or anti-oratorical. Claudel is of the very opposite tendency. He strives, in a torrent of words and ejaculations, to express his total and synthetical vision of a meaningful universe regulated by the law of complementary forces in which man has his place and rôle. These fundamental differences are obvious enough to any reader, yet once the differences are admitted it is still possible to discern areas where the two poets shared the same views.²¹ They would fall into roughly five categories and may be grouped under the following classifications: etymology; sound and shape of words; to a certain extent peculiarities of syntax and vocabulary (a predilection for certain words) and the device of special typographical presentation of a text.

Attention has already been drawn to the titles of some of Claudel's works in which a word is used in its etymological sense or with a special intention. The title of *L'Art poétique* is intended to suggest the theme or thesis

20. *Les Muses*, in *Œuvres*, I, 63. In many places Claudel calls Mallarmé 'un professeur d'attention,' in fact 'attention' is a sort of *mot-clef* in Claudel and the epitome of Mallarmé's teaching. In *Cinq Grandes Odes* (*Œuvres*, I, 138) Claudel says,

De connaître Dieu dans sa fixité et d'acquérir la vérité
par l'attention et chaque chose qui est toutes
les autres en la récréant avec son nom intelligible.

A title like *L'Œil écoute* implies an extension of the synesthetic principle of Baudelairean correspondances to the sense faculties themselves. The idea was put forth by Poe in his *Marginalia* and is used by Valéry. Cf. J. Charpentier, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

21. The problems inherent in Mallarmé's stylistic practices have been ably and fully studied by J. Schérer (*L'Expression littéraire dans l'œuvre de Mallarmé*, Paris, 1947) who has quoted from the letters drawn upon in this paper. Our concern is more with Claudel as the *partie prenante*. A. Thibaudet states in *La Poésie de Stéphane Mallarmé* (p. 358): "Jamais Mallarmé n'indiqua le moindre secret de métier." But on p. 189 he writes: "Ses Mardis furent un centre de discussions techniques. Il y fit un peu école." What Mallarmé had a horror of was *le tapage publicitaire* of manifestoes. Unlike Malherbe, he was no 'tyran des mots et des syllabes' but he was fascinated by the psychology of language. As Valéry puts it: "Il tirait de ses réflexions [sur l'art de s'exprimer] des formules d'une métaphysique singulière." *Écrits sur Mallarmé*, p. 99.

around which the treatise is constructed, for Claudel is attributing to the adjective the sense of the Greek verb "poiein," to make or create (Mallarmé: "La poésie consistant à créer"²²). *Connaissance de l'Est* is a title full of pitfalls for the translator unless he understands that Claudel is using the word *connaissance* in the special sense expounded in *L'Art poétique*. In general Claudel gives some indication or explanation when he is attaching a special or etymological meaning to a word which it no longer commonly has, but this is not always the case, especially in his poetry, where the unwary will meet with many surprises.²³ To what degree does Claudel owe this habit to the example of Mallarmé? It would be helpful if one had the latter's opinions on the subject as reported by some Boswell or Racan. Fortunately there exists another valuable source of information in Mallarmé's published study, *Les Mots anglais*.²⁴ Since the views he expressed in the study were probably repeated in conversation, it seems legitimate and useful to draw upon the work for our purpose. On the history or life of words Mallarmé writes:

Les mots dans le dictionnaire, gisent, pareils, ou de dates diverses, comme des stratifications: vite je parlerai de couches... A toute la nature apparenté et se rapprochant ainsi de l'organisme dépositaire de la vie, le Mot présente, dans ses

22. *Œuvres*, p. 870.

23. It would lengthen this paper considerably to collect all the examples of this habit of the poet. They are found principally in *L'Art poétique* (*Œuvres*, V, 44 and *passim*). A few specimens will suffice to show a powerful imagination at work: "Toute naissance est connaissance, acquérir par l'esprit et surgir" (p. 44); "Le temps est le sens de la vie (direction)" (p. 26); "L'un propose, l'autre dispose. L'un prouve, l'autre éprouve" (p. 55); "Tension, intention" (p. 65). And the etymology of *soi* "est celle de sa séparation" (p. 94). "Le nom, le nom enfin (ou le non, la différence en ce que chaque individu n'est pas l'autre)" (p. 102). One might be tempted to see in the strange names with which the author baptizes his characters an extension of this practice, as for example Mara (*L'Annonce faite à Marie*), Orian and Pensée (*Le Père humilié*). The temptation is fraught with dangers. Thus the lovely name of Prouhèze in *Le Soulier de satin* was seen by the poet on a cobbler's sign on rue Cassette while Amalric (*Partage de midi*) in real life was an umbrella dealer with a shop on Boulevard Magenta (Louis Gillet, *Claudel, Péguy*, Paris, 1946, p. 79). Others are facetious like Ali Habenichts, or place names like Cœuvre, or intended perhaps to convey their universal nowhere-ness, like Ysé. Thomas Pollock Nageoire (*L'Echange*) suggests when translated, the Boston area.

24. The importance of this work on the evolution of Mallarmé's views on poetry remains to be clarified. Thibaudet regards it as a "fort travail" but is struck "d'une stupeur" to think that Mallarmé seriously attributed any pedagogical value to it. Montel and Monda consider that "la source de toute la poésie de Mallarmé s'y trouve en quelque sorte enfermée" (*Œuvres*, p. 1636). L. Lemonnier, in his study on Poe and French poets, categorically denies that English syntax could have had the slightest influence in developing the eccentricities of Mallarmé's style which he attributes to Latin constructions. In spite of the deprecatory fashion in which Mallarmé speaks of this work in his *Lettre-autobiographique* to Verlaine, it represents, as Professor Mondor points out in his critical edition (Pléiade, p. 1636), the result of the first fourteen years of Mallarmé's teaching and was consequently begun about 1863. The principal reason and justification for drawing upon *Les Mots anglais* is Claudel's own estimate of the work: "Cet ouvrage de Mallarmé a une grosse importance—je m'étonne qu'on n'en parle pas plus souvent." ("Entretiens," in *La Nouvelle NRF*, ler juin, 1953, p. 984.)

voyelles et ses diphtongues, comme une chair; et dans ses consonnes, comme une ossature délicate à disséquer.²⁵

Mallarmé could proclaim with Hugo:

Car le mot qu'on le sache, est un être vivant.

The anatomical dissection is very instructive. Of initial vowels he states that there is little to remark save that there are few words *de terroir* in the English language which begin with a vowel whereas the consonant in the initial position gives a word its significance ("il sied d'ajouter que c'est là, à l'attaque, que réside vraiment la signification"²⁶). An example of Mallarmé's analysis may be taken from his observations on the letter B:

B fournit de nombreuses familles; et s'appuie, au commencement de chacun des mots, sur toutes les voyelles... pour mieux *causer* (our underlining here and in rest of quotation) les sens divers et cependant *liés* secrètement tous, de production ou d'enfantement, de fécondité, d'amplitude, de bouffissure et de courbature, de vantardise; puis de masse ou d'ébullition et quelquefois de bonté et de bénédiction (malgré certains vocables dont plus d'un va isolément défilier ici) [i.e. in a separate list]; significations plus ou moins *impliquées* par la labiale élémentaire.²⁷

This theory is based upon the following words: *babe, bear, birth, big, bundle, bow, belly, breed, bless, boon, bulge, bluster, boast, blow, bluff* and *boil* (the last word is translated as *furuncle*). The same process of suggestion from meaning to sound could be illustrated almost endlessly from Mallarmé's remarks in *Les Mots anglais* on the other consonants.²⁸

On alliteration and onomatopoeia Mallarmé is equally instructive and fanciful. Of the latter he maintains that they "perpétuent dans nos idiomes, un procédé de création qui fut peut-être le premier de tous."²⁹ Alliteration is the secret of all poets:

Pareil effort magistral de l'imagination désireuse, non seulement de se satisfaire par le symbole éclatant dans les spectacles du monde, mais d'établir un lien entre ceux-ci et la parole chargée de les exprimer, touche à l'un des mystères sacrés ou périlleux du Langage; et qu'il sera prudent d'analyser seulement le jour où la Science, possédant le vaste répertoire des idiomes jamais parlés sur la terre, écrira l'histoire des lettres de l'alphabet à travers tous les âges et quelle était leur presque absolue signification, tantôt devinée, tantôt méconnue par les hommes, créateurs des mots.³⁰

25. *Œuvres*, p. 901.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 926.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 928-29.

28. Mallarmé was not a complete dupe of this illusion of a phonetic and semantic correspondence. In *La Crise du vers* he writes: "A côté d'ombre opaque, ténèbres se fonce peu; quelle déception, devant la perversité conférant à jour comme à nuit, contradictoirement, des timbres, obscur ici, là clair." "Etrange arcane," *Œuvres*, p. 364.

29. *Œuvres*, p. 920.

30. Mallarmé, *Œuvres*, p. 921.

A final quotation from the same work shows less prudence on the part of Mallarmé and led Thibaudet to wonder whether the poet had been reading Plato's *Cratylus*: "la diversité sur terre des idiomes empêche personne de préférer des mots qui sinon, se trouveraient, par une frappe unique, elle-même matériellement la vérité."³¹ *Nomina, numina*.

Such statements will sound familiar to Claudel's readers, for he has expressed almost identical views in a number of his works. He not only accepts Mallarmé's ideas as plausible theories, he applies them as a sort of *mystique du Mot*. Nor do we have to ask whether he had read *Cratylus* since he quotes from the dialogue with approval in the early *Art poétique*:

Cratyle a raison de dire qu'il existe des noms naturels aux choses, et que tout homme n'est pas un artisan de noms, mais que l'est celui-là seul qui considère quel nom est naturellement propre à chaque chose et qui sait en reproduire l'Idée dans les lettres et les syllabes.³²

Claudel elaborates on the view that every word is the expression of a psychological state brought about by giving "attention" to an external object.

C'est un geste qui peut se décomposer en ses éléments ou lettres. La lettre ou, plus précisément, la *consonne*, est une attitude sonore provoquée par l'idée génératrice qu'elle mime, l'émotion, le mot. Comme S, par exemple, indique une idée de scission . . .³³

Claudel is not indulging in idle speculation; he takes the theory seriously. Examples of the use, or abuse, of the theory in practice are numerous. Of Mnemosyne Claudel writes: "Elle ressent (étant le sens intérieur de l'esprit)."³⁴ Or evoking one of the Muses, Claudel employs in its etymological sense a favorite adjective of Mallarmé: "Ecris, Clio! confère à toute chose le caractère authentique."³⁵ Like Ronsard, like Valéry (Mallarmé's direct descendant) Claudel often thought in Latin and Greek.³⁶

31. *Ibid.*, p. 364.

32. Claudel, *Œuvres*, V, 102.

33. *Ibid.*, V, 102. Cf. Mallarmé in *Les Mots anglais* (*Œuvres*, p. 947): "S . . . grâce à l'adjonction de c (en sc) c'est scission, éparpillement, entaille, etc." *L'Art poétique* is a mine of etymological nuggets but the main vein is a stratification of Mallarmean deposits. Claudel continues in the passage above quoted: "N, produite par l'occlusion de la voix, la langue de son bout venant s'attacher au palais, suggère l'idée de niveau intérieurement atteint, d'une déclaration de surdité, de refus dans une plénitude latente. In, non, hominem, nomen, numen, omnis, nemo, semen, unus, numerus, nos, nous et le groupe immense *noscere, nasci* . . ." The close connection between these views and the main thesis of *L'Art poétique* need not be stressed but it is of importance: "L'homme atteste le permanent par la parole." A complete Claudelian *lexique* would be a lengthy compilation. In general Claudel's vocabulary is less hermetic than Valéry's (cf. A. Henry: *Langage et Poésie chez Valéry*, Paris, 1952, p. 51) once Claudel's premises are understood. A comprehensive study would reveal its extraordinary richness and variety as might be expected in a poet whose ambition was to be the "rassembleur de la terre de Dieu."

34. *Cinq Grandes Odes* (*Œuvres*, I, 57).

35. *Ibid.*, I, 57.

36. Claudel also thinks in the language of the Bible (P. Rywalski, *La Bible dans l'œuvre de Paul Claudel*, Porrentruy, 1948, and K. Maurer, *Die biblische Symbolik in Werke P. Claudels*, Luzern, 1941.)

Secrète voyelle, animation de la parole qui naît
Modulation à qui tout l'esprit consonne.³⁷

Fundamentally the ambition of both Claudé and Mallarmé was to restore to words something of the magical power of their primitive freshness and to break away from the limitations of ordinary discourse. Their methods were different, it is true. Mallarmé's distilled vision of reality was conveyed by means of a sort of linguistic algebra. Claudé's poetry, on the other hand, often creates the impression that, like some *vates* in the trance of an inspiration, he is recording an apocalyptic vision. The words he uses at such moments are the same as the things they signify; the utterance is the reality contemplated and the *émotion* and the *mot* are one. "Les mots que j'emploie ce sont les mots de tous les jours, et ce ne sont point les mêmes."³⁸ Thus writes Claudé in warning his reader that the poet is able, as Mallarmé proclaims in "Le Tombeau d'Edgar Poe," to

Donner un sens plus pur aux mots de la tribu.

Mallarmé's theory of the special semantic value of the initial consonant in a word (the "charge" significance as he called it) impressed Claudé very much, as can be judged from the latter's comments upon it in his radio conversations with Jean Amrouche.³⁹ It seems likely therefore that Claudé, in the somewhat disconcerting syllabic division of words found in his early plays, is following a suggestion made by Mallarmé. Examples of such syllabic divisions are fairly common in the original versions of his plays but are often suppressed in the later reworkings. A single quotation is enough to make the matter clear:

Si vous songez que vous êtes des hommes et que vous v-
-Ous voyez empêtrés de ces vêtements d'esclaves, oh!
cri-
-Ez de rage et ne le supportez plus longtemps.⁴⁰

For a mind accustomed to finding subtleties of meaning in the sound of words it is only a step to seeing in the shape of the letters of a word an

37. *Œuvres*, I, 58.

38. "Le Tombeau d'Edgar Poe" and Claudé, *Œuvres*, I, 117.

39. Explaining his theory of the 'energy' or charge of words to Jean Amrouche Claudé says: 'Il y a tout un livre de Mallarmé justement, qui est appelé *Les Mots anglais*, où il essaye de définir les mots anglais d'après 'la charge' dont les consonnes sont représentatives, parce que, avec beaucoup de raison, il attache de l'importance encore plus aux consonnes qu'aux voyelles qui sont un élément purement musical, tandis que la consonne est l'élément énergétique. Car pour un poète, quand on parle des alliterations, n'est-ce pas, de la valeur qu'ont les consonnes placées l'une derrière l'autre, il s'agit, justement, de cet élément énergétique [...] qui est surtout traduit par la consonne.' ("Entretiens," *loc. cit.* 1er juin 1953, p. 984.) See also Claudé's "Remarque sur l'enjambement" in "Sur le vers français," *Positions et Propositions*, I, 15, where he describes this syllabic ablation as "une hémorragie du sens inclus" and the result "un Osiris typographique."

40. *Tête d'or*, Première Version in *Théâtre*, I, 104; in *La Ville, Théâtre*, I, 406.

anagogical significance as well. The importance which Mallarmé attached to the typographical arrangement of his texts, notably for *Un Coup de dés*, is well known. Valéry declares that Mallarmé, in such an arrangement, was attempting to suggest and imitate a musical score.⁴¹ However *Un Coup de dés* is subsequent to Claudel's sojourn in the Orient and it seems probable that Claudel developed his mystical interpretation of signs through his study of Chinese ideographs. But the germ of the idea, perhaps exposed by Mallarmé in one of his conversations, is contained in the quotation already given concerning alliteration and the future history of the alphabet. Claudel is less patient for future historians than Mallarmé. He states in the introduction to the calligraphic edition of his *Chemin de la croix*, executed by Guido Colluci:

Iota unum, nous dit l'Evangile, *apex unus*. Non pas seulement le i qui est la plus simple de toutes les lettres, sans aucun retour sur elle-même, l'index dirigé vers le ciel, mais le point qui lui est exactement superposé, cette étoile au-dessus de l'aiguille aimantée.⁴²

The attitude thus expressed by Claudel need not be regarded as a pathological aberration; it is an example of the child-like habits of many poets in relation to language. The letters of the alphabet, minuscule or majuscule, appeal and say much to them and it is probably this tendency to see images in the form of alphabetic symbols which led Rimbaud to write "Les Voyelles." Valéry explains very well the point of view of the poet in this

41. Valéry believed that he was the first person to whom the manuscript was shown by Mallarmé, who made something of a mystery about the work. It was published in *Cosmopolis* in 1897. See *Variété* II, 169.

42. One of the first indications of the fascination of Oriental writing for Claudel appears in the prose-poem "La Religion du signe" in *Connaissance de l'Est*: "Que d'autres découvrent dans la rangée des caractères chinois, ou une tête de mouton, ou des mains, les jambes d'un homme, le soleil qui se lève derrière un arbre. J'y poursuis pour ma part un lacs plus inextricable." My colleague, Prof. Wm. Leonard Schwartz, an expert Orientalist, has pointed out in his study on the *Imaginative Interpretation of the Far East in Modern French Literature* (p. 139) that it is evident from the above passage that Claudel had been studying Chinese ideographs. Many of the similes in *Le Repos du septième jour* are drawn from the shape of such ideographs, some scientifically correct of older picture writing, others more fanciful. The use, for some excessive, of the exclamation 'O,' which dates from the earliest plays, underlies the conception of an inexhaustible Finite in the *Art poétique* and is, in part, the symbolism at the heart of *Le Livre de Christophe Colomb* ("Je dis la vie de cet homme prédestiné dont le nom signifie Colombe et Porte-Christ [...] qui a réuni la Terre Catholique et en a fait un seul globe au-dessous de la Croix" (*Théâtre*, II, 1058). Also in his preference for the spelling of Nijinsky with a 'y' (*Positions*, I, 227) and in *L'Œil écoute*, writing on Spanish tapestry he refers humorously to "un ami fantaisiste" (surely none other than Claudel himself) who claims that ideographically *soi* and *soie* are the same word: "S représente le fil, o le coton, i le ver et le point sur l'i l'œil ou le trou (dans soie l'e représente le brin maintenant prêt à s'entortiller) [...] Le papier blanc, c'est le champ où le poète acharné, sillonné à sillon, ligne à ligne, vers à vers (ou disons comme un ver à soie), se presse soi-même comme à travers une filière, poursuit d'une plume aiguë l'avance de sa pensée vermiculaire" (*L'Œil écoute*, Paris, 1944, p. 92). Like Mallarmé, Claudel has always insisted on spelling 'poète' with a diseresis over the first e.

connection when he writes: "La poésie est toute païenne; elle exige impérieusement qu'il n'y ait point d'âme sans corps, point de sens, point d'idée, qui ne soit l'acte de quelque figure *remarquable*, construite de timbres, de durées, d'intensités."⁴³ It would perhaps be wiser if the poets left the theorizing to the Lotes, Rousselots and Grammonts. As Jean Paulhan points out, to attempt to explain the part of mystery in poetry is to deny its existence.

It is probable that the interest shown by both Mallarmé and Claudel in questions of language was intensified by their study of foreign languages. Although no polyglot, Mallarmé had a considerable knowledge of Latin, Greek and English. In addition to these languages, Claudel had some degree of mastery of several others, including Chinese and Japanese. It is not entirely unlikely that certain of Mallarmé's syntactical peculiarities were formed by the habit, acquired in his teaching of English, of making interlinear translations. Compare for example this sentence from *Les Mots anglais*: "Que moins que celles-ci [les langues germaniques] doivent vivre celles-là [les langues néo-latines] toujours pareilles à elles-mêmes et stagnantes, on peut l'affirmer"⁴⁴ with the illustration of fourth-century Moeso-Gothic Mallarmé selects from the *Evangelies* of Ulphilas:

Svase	yah	veis	afietam	thaim	skulam	unsaraim
So	as	yea	we	off-let	those	debtors
Comme	oui	nous	laissions	de côté	ces	debiteurs
						des nôtres. ⁴⁵

Such a practice can soon become inveterate, almost, as it were, a *tic*. Claudel also has devoted much of his time to translating. His published translations range from the *Orestia* and parts of the Bible to certain English and Japanese poets. In general Claudel's method of translating is much freer than Mallarmé's, as he aspires to capture some of the spirit and rhythm of the original.⁴⁶

It will be recalled that Claudel's eulogy applied to Mallarmé the prose writer. Now many characteristics of Mallarmé's syntax—his use of the demonstrative pronouns in isolated positions, his suppression of relative pronouns and auxiliary verbs, his avoidance of *pas* and *point* in negations—are traits of Claudel's style also, particularly in his poetry, and are examined in some detail by J. de Tonquédec in his study of Claudel.⁴⁷ One is struck too by the frequent ellipses, syllepses and anacolutha which are

43. *Ecrits sur Stéphane Mallarmé*, p. 50.

44. *Œuvres*, p. 1049.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 905. H. Fabureau, speaking of Mallarmé's mania for etymologies, says that he quoted the Visigothic bible of Bishop Ulphilas in almost every class, while the students entered the game quickly and bought Loebe's *Grammatica gothicae linguae* (H. Fabureau, *Stéphane Mallarmé*, Paris, 1933).

46. R. Johannot mentions Claudel's "goût pour les traductions juxtalineaires" but gives no proof. See *Hommage à Paul Claudel* (Juvisy: Editions du Cerf, 1935), p. 148.

47. J. de Tonquédec, *Paul Claudel* (Paris, 1917), pp. 151-55 and *passim*.

to be found in both authors. After quoting a passage from *L'Art poétique*, de Tonquédec exclaims: "Mais c'est du Mallarmé!" There is in both writers a "spoken" quality in the way words are employed which gives a sort of broken aspect to their styles. In Claudel's poetry the rush of words seems impatient of organization as it reproduces the rapid movement of thought and emotion in sudden leaps and bounds, correcting and completing itself by additions or chaotic enumerations. With Mallarmé the line of his sentence is an encircling movement, an *emboîtement* as Thibaudet called it, caused, one suspects, by hesitation or fear that reality will escape his grasp, or perhaps also by a certain coquetry and preciosity that refuses to call a thing by its name. In a sense, Mallarmé is a *prose-libriste* and Claudel a *vers-libriste*; but in each the liberties taken with conventional syntax are for calculated effects. It must be added that in prosody they are far removed. Mallarmé remains faithful to traditional versification, with the exception of some rhythmical *procédés* of his own. Claudel on the other hand breaks completely from the *fausses contraintes* and has attempted to create a prosodic system based upon what he calls *l'iambe fondamental*.⁴⁸

An adequate study of the metaphors and imagery in the two poets would require a whole book. Like most poets, they think in metaphors and analogies. Indeed the metaphor is for Claudel an instrument of investigation like the syllogism, in fact replacing the syllogism, as he explains in *L'Art poétique*. The image serves as a rapid simplification in their metaphors in the same way that the enthymeme serves as a short cut in syllogistic reasoning. Conceits, analogies, noble periphrases, in short a constant striving to reveal unusual relationships between objects, form the very substance of their manner of seeing the world. "La pointe," as Thibaudet cleverly puts it, "est la rime de la pensée." With Claudel imagery usually helps to deepen the over-all sense of the interdependency of objects, but it is frequently marked with the preciosity of much of Mallarmé's rhetoric. One example from an early work of Claudel:

Maintenant près d'un palais couleur de souci dans
les arbres aux toits nombreux ombrageant un trône pourri
J'habite d'un vieux empire le décombre principal.⁴⁹

The statement means that the poet is living at the time in Peiping. Such mannerism may or may not be found pleasing but, once the habit is ac-

48. There is no more damaging innuendo for the reputation of a French writer than to be accused of winning acclaim in Germany (Jules Romains' *Cromedeyre-le-vieil*) and/or not knowing his native language, as was hinted by Lasserre and de Tonquédec in the case of Claudel. For having failed to heed the poet's warning ("O grammairien dans mes vers, ne cherche point le chemin, cherche le centre"), past and future critics are paid off in *Le Soulier de satin*: "Chère grammaire, belle grammaire, délicieuse grammaire, fille, épouse, mère, maîtresse et gagne-pain des professeurs . . . Une langue sans professeurs, c'est comme une justice sans juges, comme un contrat sans notaire! Une licence épouvantable!" (*Théâtre*, II, 694).

49. *Œuvres*, I, 72.

quired, it is not easily lost. Here is a second example from an appreciation Claudel wrote on Honegger in 1945. The author is alone in the orchestra pit of an empty concert hall:

Et moi pour le moment tout seul au milieu de ce matériel disert je ne vous demande que la mailloche du timbalier et le droit d'interroger de quelques coups timides et malhabiles tout le silence sous la membrane oraculaire que peut recéler une sphère qu'on a coupée par le plan de l'équateur.⁵⁰

Gorgibus could understandably have difficulty in grasping what the poet is talking about.

Whether Mallarmé's conception of the theatre of the future had any influence upon the evolution of Claudel's own dramatic compositions is difficult to determine with any certainty. The likelihood seems remote. Indeed Claudel professed to have only a very vague idea of Mallarmé's views on the subject ("l'explication du monde . . . autant que j'ai pu le comprendre . . . par une sorte d'énonciation scénique ou de programme auquel la musique et la danse auraient servi de commentaire."⁵¹ Nevertheless certain of Mallarmé's speculations point in the direction of the Claudelian drama, particularly *Le Soulier de satin*. Above all, the conception of the theatre as a ritualistic celebration in which music and ballet blend in enacting a timeless Fable of the fate of man. The exclusion of any material episode and the emphasis Mallarmé places upon the active participation of the spectators in the lyrical drama itself—all these are elements that are found in Claudel's plays. In reading certain passages of the article Mallarmé wrote on Richard Wagner in 1885, one almost has the feeling that Mallarmé is describing his impression of *Tête d'or* or *La Ville*. He declares:

A moins que la Fable, vierge de tout, lieu, temps et personne sus, ne se dévoile empruntée au sens latent en le concours de tous, celle inscrite sur la page des Cieux et dont l'Histoire même n'est que l'interprétation, vaine, c'est-à-dire un Poème, l'Ode . . . Type sans dénomination préalable, pour qu'émane la surprise: son geste résume vers soi nos rêves de sites ou de paradis, qu'engouffre l'antique scène avec une prétention vide à les contenir ou à les peindre. Lui, quelqu'un! ni cette scène, quelque part (l'erreur connexe, décor stable et acteur réel, du Théâtre manquant de la Musique): est-ce un fait spirituel, l'épanouissement de symboles ou leur préparation, nécessité endroit, pour s'y développer, autre que le fictif foyer de vision dardé par le regard d'une foule!⁵²

In the domain of dramatic theory and practice Mallarmé's authority no doubt appeared less imposing to Claudel than Shakespeare's, Aeschylus's or Calderon's. Yet even here a remarkable kinship of outlook is apparent.

But influence operates in a double manner: action and reaction. Cer-

50. "Arthur Honegger" in *L'Œil écoute*, Paris, 1945.

51. *Positions et Propositions*, I, 204.

52. *Œuvres*, p. 545.

tain similarities between the two writers have been indicated, of both a general and a technical nature, notably in matters of language and in the importance they attached to a method of investigation to penetrate the mysteries of the Cosmos. There may be no such thing as spontaneous generation in literature and it is true that Claudel possesses some traits which relate him to the French Symbolists who were writing about 1885. But it means little to call him *un symboliste attardé* because in a sense all great poets are symbolists. Claudel could become a poet of very high rank only by reacting against the influence that has been studied in the preceding pages. Reaction is an assertion of individuality.

Ce n'est pas avec l'encre et la plume
Qu'on fait une parole vivante.⁵³

.....
Ainsi un poème n'est pas un sac à mots, il
n'est pas seulement
Ces choses qu'il signifie, mais il est lui-même un signe
un acte imaginaire créant
Le temps nécessaire à sa résolution
A l'imitation de l'action humaine dans ses ressorts
et dans ses poids.⁵⁴

The catastrophe of *Igitur* is turned into victory. Placed before a flower Mallarmé will say:

Je dis une fleur! et, hors de l'oubli où ma voix relègue aucun contour, en tant que quelque chose d'autre que les calices sus, musicalement se lève, idée même et suave, l'absente de tous bouquets.⁵⁵

To which Claudel seems to answer:

C'est son absence seule qui me fait vivre.⁵⁶

Stanford University

53. *Cinq Grandes Odes* in *Œuvres*, I, 120.

54. *Ibid.* I, 59.

55. Mallarmé, *Œuvres*, p. 857.

56. *Cantate à trois voix* in *Œuvres*, I, 179.

REVIEWS

Pascal par lui-même. Images et textes présentés par Albert Béguin. Paris: Aux Editions du Seuil, 1952. Pp. 192.

Dans Pascal: Essai en parlant de son style. Par Jean Demorest. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1953. Pp. 198.

The colorful and highly controversial figure of Blaise Pascal never fails to captivate his readers. He evokes praise or blame, sympathy or hostility, or both in turn; one cannot be indifferent to him. His disciples and enemies are legion. For nearly three centuries they have endeavored with varying success to fathom the enigmatic character of the man and his work. Scholars and critics have offered constructive help with their probing analyses and scientific re-evaluation of the evidence available, but despite their best efforts Pascal the man persistently eludes our grasp. He diverts attention from himself to the laws governing the physical universe, to man's condition in that universe, to man's temporal and spiritual welfare. However, because Pascal's style is so personal and dynamic, we often mistake for a self-portrait one which has been altered to our own dimensions. Imperceptibly our prejudices force their way into the picture as Pascal jolts our self-complacency and challenges deep-seated convictions.

Thus the portrait varies with each generation. Voltaire, Chateaubriand, Victor Cousin, Brunschvicg, and Chevalier all reflect, to some extent at least, the changing climate of opinion in their interpretations of Pascal. Béguin and Demorest are no exception. Indeed *Pascal par lui-même* and *Dans Pascal* demonstrate more effectively perhaps than other recent studies the radical transformation which Pascal is undergoing in our day. Tourneur and Lafuma revolutionized the approach to the study of the *Pensées*, but that was merely the beginning. The new Pascal, mid-twentieth century version, is the real surprise. This talented, impetuous youth, vividly described by Béguin, makes quick decisions, energetically tackles new problems for the sheer "joie de connaître," will not brook rivalry, seizes the opportunity to debate vigorously the scientific and religious issues of his day, yet accepts with enthusiastic confidence the grace of conversion finding therein true joy and peace. The same exuberant spirit characterizes Demorest's Pascal. He feels that it is good to be alive and desires to communicate this joy. To seek escape from reality is a "monstrous thing." Reality for Pascal has a threefold aspect: man, the world in which he lives, and God. In order to deepen and extend his knowledge of reality he relies essentially upon experience and instinct. Pascal's passion for the concrete, according to Demorest, dominates his life, thought, and style. This is a far cry from the quiet, austere, reticent Pascal of Gilberte Périer and other early biographers, not to mention the "sublime misanthrope" of Voltaire

and the anguished Pascal of the romantics. Béguin and Demorest give us a Pascal more in keeping with our modern spirit and taste. Is the portrait genuine? Both authors plead their cause with sincere enthusiasm and vigorous determination but not with uniform success.

Pascal par lui-même presents, through a judicious selection of his works, Pascal himself in the role of inventor, polemist and apologist. In three lucid, well-integrated essays which form the preface to the Pascalian texts, Béguin reconstructs the plan of the *Pensées* according to his novel interpretation of Pascal's genius and concludes with a brilliant analysis of the inherent weaknesses in the "Christian individualist" position typified by Pascal, in particular his lack of historical perspective.

On the whole Béguin argues his case well. From Pascal's life, works, and correspondence he draws ample, convincing proof in support of his contention that Pascal's genius bears the indelible stamp of his vibrant personality. Too often we forget that Pascal lived only thirty-nine years. There is all the impulsiveness of youth in his initial enthusiasm for any problem which engaged his diversified talents. For the moment nothing else mattered to him. He worked feverishly to arrive at a swift solution which he would merely indicate in broad outline, leaving to others the task of filling in details. This impatience may be attributed in part to a race against time prompted by Pascal's delicate health which constantly threatened to curtail his activities, but it stems largely from his buoyant temperament and youthful ardor. According to Béguin the same dynamic qualities pervade Pascal's style: "Ce style est un style du paradoxe, donc de la surprise, de l'étonnement, le plus apte qui soit à traduire l'impatience et la joie de découvrir" (p. 12).

Béguin's attempt to give a consistent portrait of Pascal as a "génie juvénile" forces him into a somewhat ambiguous position in regard to Pascal's religious thought. He stresses the impetuous character of the two "conversions" especially of the second or definitive conversion (1654), and at the same time dwells at length upon the profound, lasting influence of the latter event. Pascal's mystical experience of November 23, 1654, although a sudden revelation, was also the culminating point of the spiritual crisis which he had been undergoing for more than a year. Béguin scarcely mentions this period of intellectual confusion and spiritual unrest. However, his penetrating analysis of the celebrated *Mystère de Jésus* merits special commendation. This meditation on Christ's agony in the garden of Gethsemane reveals the depths of Pascal's spirituality. In the person of Jesus Christ all his contradictions are resolved: pride gives way to humility, doubt to certitude, discontent and restlessness to lasting joy and peace. The passion or patience—Béguin equates the two—of the Saviour solves for Pascal the riddle of human existence, the mysterious but none the less real blend of joy and suffering, *grandeur* and *misère*, patience and impatience which are the lot of man.

Pascal's apostolic zeal found an outlet in his proposed Apology of the Christian religion intended for the libertines of his day but never completed. The fragmentary *Pensées*, however, reveal his apologetic method which forms the subject of Béguin's second essay. It is clear from the outset that Béguin is firmly opposed to interpreting the *Pensées* as Pascal's personal diary so to speak. They are less a record of Pascal's own religious experience than of his concern for the plight of the libertines and his desire for their spiritual welfare. It is their condition which he most frequently describes in the dialogue of the *Pensées*, and his apologetic method is indeed not a method at all in the strict sense of the word but rather an "art de persuader." Reason had become the god of the libertines. To dethrone it in their eyes was therefore the necessary preliminary step in combating their religious indifference. Likewise the confusion and anguish which they experience when they are made aware of the disproportion between man and the cosmos are only additional means used by Pascal to disturb their complacent pride. Having thus inspired in the libertines a fear bordering on despair, Pascal in the second part of his Apology shifts from a negative to a positive approach. "Il reste maintenant à remonter de cet abîme à la joie, selon une marche ascendante dont Pascal ne ménagera pas les paliers avec moins d'attention: tout son effort, désormais, tendra à prouver que l'homme peut, même dans un monde sans commune mesure avec lui-même, trouver ensemble sa mesure et un havre de paix" (pp. 51-52). Underlying the famous wager argument and Pascal's proofs of the Christian religion which center about Jesus Christ is the dominant note of joy, joy in the knowledge that man through charity can unite himself with God and transcend his own weakness. Although Béguin's attempt to divorce Pascal's religious thought from the doctrine of Port-Royal and to justify the wager argument on the basis of its appeal to pragmatic sanctions is certain to antagonize a number of "Pascalisans," his essay is a penetrating critical and expository study of Pascal's apologetic method.

To date, most of the adverse criticism of the Apology proper has been confined to Pascal's limitations as a biblical exegete. Béguin uncovers more serious shortcomings. In "Pascal sans histoire," the most original and provocative of his three essays, he indicts Pascal on several counts, relating them all to his circumscribed view of Christianity: his oversimplified description of man's condition; his negligible treatment of the key doctrines of the Mystical Body and the communion of saints; his disregard of a theology of history. These inherent weaknesses of which Pascal and his contemporaries were unaware, diminish the persuasive force of his Apology today. In Pascal's day Christianity placed great emphasis on the individual conscience, on working out one's salvation in solitude and retirement from the world. It placed little emphasis on a community sense, on the social mission of the Church, and the concomitant doctrines of the Mystical Body and the communion of saints which are so prominent today. Béguin

does not imply, of course, that Pascal ignored these doctrines. Indeed the *Pensées* reveal that he had a vivid conception of them but they are situated in a perpetual present. In other words history does not enter into Pascal's perspective of salvation. Humanity in organic growth applies only to the development of experimental knowledge (*Préface du Traité du vide*) in the course of time. Pascal circumscribes the Christian life within the limits of his "art de persuader." He lacks the ample vision of the early Church fathers, of Dante, and among the moderns of Claudel, Péguy, and Bloy. The Church in Pascal's eyes is the rock, the symbol of subsistence and stability in a changing world. He overlooks the development of the Church in time, the development of Christian doctrine through the centuries.¹ On the whole Pascal's shortcomings as an apologist reflect the climate of his age. His superiority lies in his elucidation of the perennial problems of the Christian conscience, thanks to the dynamic quality of his spirituality.

In the selections from Pascal's works which follow Béguin's essays the *Pensées* receive the lion's share. One excerpt from the *Avis* concerning the adding machine and from the *Lettres Provinciales* hardly does justice to Pascal the mathematician and polemist. However, *Pascal par lui-même* contains a useful, selective bibliography, a chronology of Jansenism (1602-1709) including the principal events in Pascal's life, and explanatory notes on the various editions of the *Pensées*. Numerous illustrations, including the portrait of Pascal by Philippe de Champaigne recently discovered by Moussalli, add to the attractiveness of this compact little volume which we recommend both to the scholar and the general reader.

Like Béguin, Demorest stresses the profound unity underlying Pascal's thought and work, and his sense of the discontinuity of duration so typical of his century. In other respects, however, particularly in scope, method of approach, and interpretation of Pascal, *Dans Pascal* contrasts sharply with *Pascal par lui-même*.

Demorest focuses attention mainly upon Pascal the thinker and poet. His reflections on Pascal's literary art serve as the point of departure for an elaborate presentation of Pascal's theory of knowledge. In regard to Pascal's style, the author's thorough understanding and vivid treatment of his subject combine to give us a finely nuanced study of Pascal's art as a writer: his passion for the concrete, powerful imagination, variety of imagery, keen sense of rhythm, brilliant antithesis and paradox. In the domain of Pascal's thought, however, Demorest's footing is less sure. Because he finds Pascal's esthetic ideal incompatible with a rationalist Pascal, he is eager to dismiss the latter without formality yet disconcerted by Pascal's own testimony that the dignity of man consists in his thought. He compromises by minimizing the role of reason whenever possible in Pascal's theory of knowledge without excluding it entirely. Pascal, he maintains, gives preeminence to

1. For a detailed treatment of this question see John Henry Newman, *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1949).

the senses and especially to intuition in the cognitive process and tends to depreciate reason: "... Il ne semble accorder d'efficacité humaine à la connaissance que dans la mesure où le sentiment parvient à la posséder, à l'assimiler et à en rendre compte par un mouvement de nature instinctive" (p. 30). "Dans Pascal, la *libido sciendi* cède toujours à la *libido sentiendi* qui seule rend compte de l'homme" (p. 32).

The personal element in *Dans Pascal* is at once its chief merit and most vulnerable point. Instead of having recourse to external evidence, Demorest concentrates on Pascal's language and style in order to fathom the personality behind the written word. He succeeds in capturing the buoyant spirit of Pascal and in conveying to the reader his profound sensibility and dramatic genius. In regard to Pascal's thought however he lacks clearness and consistency and depends more on dramatic effect than on cogent arguments. From the author's description it would be difficult to determine, for example, what constitutes for Pascal the basis of human knowledge. Is it sense experience? Demorest dwells at length on Pascal's "vocation sensorielle" but maintains that he is not a "sensitif" since sensation is for him a means not an end. For the same reason he cannot be considered an intuitionist, although he yields to the "irrationnel" or the intuitive absorption of a truth after having exhausted all the experimental possibilities of the subject. "L'irrationnel est un mouvement total longuement préparé par l'épreuve de la raison. Expérience et raison sont la terre d'où surgissent les droits rameaux de l'instinct allant chercher le ciel" (p. 41). In view of Demorest's contention that Pascal is not anti-rationalist, the word "irrationnel" which he uses interchangeably with "intuition" and "instinct" is misleading since it immediately calls to mind an anti-rationalist Pascal. The author tries to rectify the matter by acknowledging that "sous-rationnel" or "pré-rationnel" (p. 42) might be more pertinent. By this time the reader has become entangled in a war of words that adds to his confusion regarding the general purpose and plan of the work.

On the other hand Demorest copes skillfully with a difficult problem in his lucid, competent analysis of Pascal's style. His best chapters are perhaps those dealing with Pascal's use of imagery and movement. Sometimes Pascal creates images by personifying abstractions. More often, however, he turns an indefinite substantive into an image by means of simple metaphor. Generally he prefers visual to auditory images and offers an astonishing variety of them. Within a tableau which at the outset appears to be nothing more than a vivid comparison we soon discover autonomous images moving. Likewise the concurrence of tableaux gives the effect of movement. Lastly, Pascal's extensive use of dialogue, to which Demorest rightly devotes considerable attention, contributes greatly to his spirited style.

Pascal par lui-même and *Dans Pascal* do not solve the many problems raised by the life and work of Pascal. In dealing with so complex and universal a genius there will always be room for fresh speculation. It is

clear, however, from these two works that the vigorous personality of the author of the *Pensées* constitutes their greatest claim to originality.

SISTER MARIE LOUISE, O.P.

Albertus Magnus College

L'Esprit du mal et l'esthétique baudelairienne. Par Marcel A. Ruff. Paris: Armand Colin, 1955. Pp. 492.

Baudelaire, l'homme et l'œuvre. Par Marcel A. Ruff. Paris: Hatier-Boivin, 1955. Pp. 212.

Marcel Ruff is already known to Baudelaire scholars for his work on the architecture of *Les Fleurs du Mal*. This spring his doctoral thesis, on which he had been working for twenty-five years, was defended in a six-hour *soutenance* at the Sorbonne, and appeared in print soon afterwards. At the same time he has contributed the latest addition to the excellent "Connaissance des Lettres" series.

The epigraph of the thesis, taken from a letter of Baudelaire to Poulet-Malassis, is "Toute littérature dérive du péché." Ruff's position is that the problem of evil is at the center of Baudelaire's life and thought, and that from it he derived a new conception of poetry and of art in general. The object of the book is "de déterminer la situation de la poésie baudelairienne en fonction de l'idée du Mal, situation si différente de tout ce qui l'avait précédée, que rien de ce qui l'a suivie n'y a pu rester indifférent" (p. 8).

It is necessary however, according to Ruff, to consider earlier conceptions of the problem of evil, but only from the time when it became for writers "un élément non plus seulement *externe*, mais *interne* de leur esthétique." Ruff finds this moment in the eighteenth century. Just why, he does not explain, and it seems somewhat curious that, with the great stress he lays later on Baudelaire's Jansenist background, he does not go back at least to the late seventeenth century. The first two parts of the book, "Descente aux enfers" and "Emmanuel et Satan," are devoted to the treatment of the problem of evil by a large number of writers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including Marivaux, Prévost, the *philosophes*, Byron, Maturin, the early French romantics and finally the Jeune-France group and their contemporaries. These two parts take up over one third of the text, and I believe that the book would have gained in focus and in unity if they had been drastically reduced in length. They contain much valuable and interesting material, but a good deal of it seems irrelevant to the subject of the book. Some of the authors treated, such as Marivaux and Prévost, are never mentioned again, and many others only barely. There is too little perspective, too little synthesis; one feels lost in a wilderness of details where the signposts are few and far between. One would also like clearer distinctions among the very different

attitudes towards the problem, from the radical questioning of traditional notions of good and evil by the *philosophes* to the fascination with evil for evil's sake of later writers.

The third and fourth parts, "L'Innocent Paradis" and "Les Limbes," follow Baudelaire's life and work chronologically up to the publication of *Les Fleurs du Mal* in 1857. While one may disagree with some of the author's interpretations, the facts are presented with great accuracy, and valuable new material is brought to light. There is convincing proof that Baudelaire's "moi, fils d'un prêtre" was no *boutade*, that his father had indeed been ordained and had frequented Jansenist circles, and that his mother had a similar background. Even so, to speak of "l'ombre janséniste qui n'a cessé de l'envelopper" seems something of an exaggeration. There is a thorough rehabilitation of General Aupick, which is fully supported by Claude Pichois' recent articles on Aupick in the *Mercure de France*. And Ruff brings convincing evidence that the "voyage aux Indes" probably lasted several months longer than has been thought (Appendix VIII).

Ruff claims that Jeanne Duval was not the maleficent influence she has been considered, but was rather "une compagne compréhensive." He quotes the far from infrequent letters in which Baudelaire expresses his tenderness for Jeanne, but not those which give the other side of the picture, such as the famous diatribe of March 27, 1852, beginning: "Jeanne est devenue un obstacle non seulement à mon bonheur . . . mais encore au perfectionnement de mon esprit." Ruff also, with valid reasons, sets aside some of the poems included in the Jeanne Duval cycle as not addressed to her, and concludes: "Tout le reste du cycle exprime le sentiment le plus ardent, le plus 'adorant,' mais aussi le plus tendre et le plus confiant" (p. 189). When one remembers that among the poems still left in the cycle are "Je t'adore à l'égal de la voûte nocturne" and "Le Léthé" (neither of which is ever mentioned), it is hard to be entirely convinced.

As one goes on, one is made increasingly aware of Ruff's conviction that the contradictions in Baudelaire's life and work are only apparent and that there is an underlying unity. There is much truth in this, but the author seems to me to go too far in his search for unity, to eliminate contradictions rather than to explain them, and thus to oversimplify. This is particularly evident when he comes to Baudelaire's activities and writings in 1848 and the years immediately following, in which most writers have seen a marked deviation, though not an inexplicable one, from his general development and particularly from his esthetic doctrine. For Ruff Baudelaire's attitude was not the result of any definite political opinion: "il se range d'instinct aux côtés de ceux qui souffrent et de ceux qui se révoltent contre l'injustice et l'oppression" (p. 234). And the strongly expressed opinions on the utility of art and the secondary importance of form do not, according to Ruff, contradict Baudelaire's later beliefs. He is however more moderate in his comments on individual texts than in his

general statements. Thus he says of "La Raçon": "son humanitarisme évangélique, son intention didactique d'utilité permettent d'en fixer la composition entre 1848 et 1851, sans risque d'erreur" (p. 249). After 1851 Ruff finds in Baudelaire an increasingly spiritual orientation: "Le sentiment de sa culpabilité, le sentiment du Mal et de son problème métaphysique, dominant maintenant en lui, à l'exclusion de toutes autres préoccupations plus ou moins sociales" (p. 264). The influence of Poe is quite rightly minimized, but I find it curious that almost nothing is said of Joseph de Maistre, whom Baudelaire certainly discovered about this time, and whose ideas and vocabulary he so often echoes.

The fifth and last part of the book, "Fleurs du Mal," is to me the most satisfying one. The first and second editions are discussed, both the individual poems and the architecture of the volumes. Here again, when the author is dealing closely with texts, his tendency towards oversimplification is less apparent and there is more subtlety in his comments. His treatment of the architecture problem is excellent, and happily free from the rigidity of many earlier discussions. "Les poèmes sont groupés selon l'analogie de leurs sujets ou de leur inspiration, on peut même retrouver un ordre dans la succession de ces groupements, mais plus d'une intervention de détail serait possible sans qu'il en résultât de différence sensible pour l'effet général" (p. 294). In dealing with the various cycles Ruff admits the possibility that some of the poems in the Madame Sabatier cycle may not have been written for her, but he does not mention Albert Feuillerat's very convincing arguments for putting "A celle qui est trop gaie" among the poems addressed to Marie Daubrun, of whom Ruff has almost nothing to say, jettisoning Feuillerat's work on her in somewhat cavalier fashion.

Ruff makes an excellent case for his statement that the first edition of *Les Fleurs du Mal* is concerned with the destiny, not of man in general, but of the artist. In the years between the first and second editions the focus shifts and the scope of the volume is enlarged to cover the destiny of all mankind. Ruff goes on to the assumption that many of the poems added in the second edition are objective in character, dealing not with the poet's own vices but with those of others, although "il y est associé, sinon par ses actes, du moins par son 'désir éternel et coupable.'" The final chapter of this section, "Permanence de l'esthétique," insists on Baudelaire's continued spiritual progress. Ruff rightly points out that Jacques Crépet's restoration to *Fusées* of certain passages formerly placed at the end of *Mon Cœur mis à nu* is not—nor did Crépet himself so claim—a decisive argument for a fall from grace in Baudelaire's last years. Ruff insists that, in spite of moments of doubt or of revolt, Baudelaire's faith was kept to the last and permeated all he wrote. "Il est le poète du péché, c'est-à-dire le poète du Mal en tant que tel, parce que le sentiment du Mal, communiqué dans sa plus grande violence par toutes les puissances

de l'art, attise cette soif du ciel qui est pour Baudelaire la forme la plus haute de l'émotion esthétique" (p. 365).

The conclusion of the book deals briefly with the treatment of evil by later poets. Ruff refuses to admit Mallarmé and Valéry, Claudel and Péguy, as the authentic successors of Baudelaire, and finds them in Lautréamont, Rimbaud, Jarry and the surrealists, with the reservation that there was in Baudelaire not a refusal, but a conflict. "Mais l'essentielle nouveauté n'est pas dans le thème choisi, elle est dans la fonction même qui se trouve ainsi assignée à la poésie, et à l'art en général. Comme l'écrit Tristan Tzara en 1916: 'La poésie n'est pas uniquement un produit écrit, une succession d'images et de sons, mais *une manière de vivre*.' Cette intégration de l'éthique dans l'esthétique a été consciemment réalisée par Baudelaire dès ses débuts" (p. 373). And the final sentence of the book is: "Baudelaire a rétabli la poésie au cœur même de la destinée humaine."

By the nature of its subject the book takes its place in the long line of discussions of Baudelaire's religion—or lack of religion. Ruff recognizes in Baudelaire the "deux postulations simultanées, l'une vers Dieu, l'autre vers Satan." But for him Baudelaire is definitely on the side of the angels; "À mesure qu'il est davantage obsédé et même accablé par la présence du Mal, sa spiritualité en reçoit comme un aliment nouveau" (p. 322). Unlike nearly all writers on the subject, Ruff denies that, "sauf dans les moments de crise," the idea of redemption is absent from Baudelaire's work, and maintains that his Christian universe is a complete one. He does indeed admit that Baudelaire was "un catholique *en marge*," and that there were lapses in his faith, but throughout the emphasis is on a positive faith. On the whole the treatment seems to me less satisfactory than that of Jean Massin in his *Baudelaire entre Dieu et Satan* (1946), which is to my mind the best discussion of the subject. One certainly cannot put Ruff among the writers of whom Massin says: "Il y a toute une tradition universitaire, et qui a la vie longue, pour rejeter le Catholicisme entier dans la chausse-trape du péché originel. Croit-on le monde imparfait et l'homme misérable? on est catalogué chrétien." On the contrary, Ruff makes every possible effort to demonstrate the orthodoxy of what Massin, with all his sympathy for Baudelaire, calls "un drôle de christianisme." Certainly each one of us creates, to some extent, his own "mythe de Baudelaire," and Ruff's is a sympathetic and plausible one. My only criticism is that it is one-sided and not sufficiently complex. Baudelaire's vehemence and anger, his bitterness and irony are veiled by a spirituality and a concern with man's fate that are indeed part of him, but not all.

But Ruff's originality lies in his treatment not merely of Baudelaire's personal attitude towards evil, but of its relation to his esthetics. The chief difficulty I find in the book is a failure to define clearly just what is meant by *esthétique*. At the beginning it seems to mean simply a conception of

poetry and of art in general (p. 8). Later it includes a theory of poetic creation: "le lien entre l'éthique et l'esthétique, entre le mal et la création poétique est déjà fortement accusé" (p. 169). Yet at another point there is a distinction between "la poétique . . . et l'esthétique ou philosophie de la poésie" (p. 228). As far as I can see, Ruff's esthetics deals first with the subject matter, then with the function of poetry: "La matière poétique par excellence est donc bien le Mal, puisque l'objet le plus élevé que puissent se proposer le poète et l'artiste est d'éveiller dans sa totalité la conscience de la condition humaine" (p. 365). It seems very clear that questions of poetic form are expressly excluded: "Peut-être que la grande nouveauté de la *musique* baudelairienne est précisément dans cette adaptation à un sujet lui-même nouveau, et qui est le Mal. Il faudrait, pour le démontrer, une étude de détail qui n'est pas dans notre propos" (p. 316).

This dissociation of form and matter seems to me regrettable, and leads to the most debatable aspect of the book, its consistent minimizing of Baudelaire's preoccupation with poetic form. Early in his discussion Ruff quotes the note in the *Salon de 1846*: "Il faut entendre par la naïveté du génie la science du métier combinée avec le *gnôti séanton*, mais la science modeste laissant le beau rôle au tempérament," and comments: "Toutes ses variations sur ce sujet se ramèneront à mettre un peu plus d'insistance sur l'un ou sur l'autre point, selon le genre dont il s'agit et le public auquel il s'adresse" (p. 218). He maintains that the emphasis on morality and utility of the Pierre Dupont article of 1851 represents a position from which Baudelaire never departed. I would certainly agree that Baudelaire was never a wholehearted partisan of art for art's sake, that his doctrine was not Gautier's or even Poe's and that he never ceased to insist on the inherent morality of art. But to say that for him "l'art cesse d'être un effort de création extérieure. L'œuvre d'art n'est plus un *objet* que l'on admire du dehors. Elle n'est valable que par son *action*" (p. 267), seems to me to belittle unduly the artist in Baudelaire, to forget that for him imagination was "la reine des facultés" and a command of language, "une sorcellerie évocatoire," one of the greatest gifts of the poet. It is true that for him, as for Diderot, technique alone, without *naïveté*, was sterile. But, again like Diderot, he expressed in any number of passages his belief that it is impossible for the artist or the poet to express his ideal without a mastery of his technique. The article on Auguste Barbier affirms that neglect of form is "l'anéantissement de la poésie," and a letter of 1860 contains a diatribe against Musset's total inability to understand "le travail par lequel une rêverie devient un objet d'art" (*Correspondance générale*, III, 38). For Baudelaire "il n'y [a] d'admissible que la perfection" (*Ibid.*, II, 38). I believe that no small part of Baudelaire's greatness lies in the equilibrium he attained, in practice and in theory, between morality and art, between matter and form.

My basic criticism of the book is that it somewhat upsets this equi-

librium. It is an admirable and irrefutable demonstration of the importance of morality and religion in Baudelaire's work. But it is weighted too heavily on this side; the great central tensions are relaxed, the fearful attraction of evil is mitigated, and the artist is obscured by the moralist. Evidence in favor of the thesis of the book is emphasized, contrary evidence is too often explained away or ignored. One can accept almost everything that is said on the positive side; it is the negations and omissions that are disquieting. Yet, whatever reservations one may make, the book remains an extraordinarily stimulating one, full of valuable material and written with great sympathy and understanding.

The little "Connaissance des Lettres" volume is in large measure a condensation of the larger book, with the addition of some material not relevant to the thesis. The necessity of brevity results in a rather less convincing presentation of Ruff's central ideas; much of the documentation had perforce to be omitted and the statements are more categorical. It is hardly surprising that the least satisfactory part of the book is that which deals with Baudelaire's art. The chapter "Sorcellerie évocatoire" gives a rather pedestrian analysis, and some important points, such as vocabulary and imagery, are passed over very briefly, with an apology for lack of space to treat them adequately. The chapter seems to me inferior both to Jean Prévost's admirable chapters in his *Baudelaire: Essai sur l'inspiration et la création poétique* (1953) and to the chapter (of practically the same length as Ruff's) "L'Art baudelairien," in Henri Peyre's *Connaissance de Baudelaire* (1951).

Ruff is of course completely justified in presenting only his own interpretation in his thesis. But I do regret that in the small book, published in a series whose original title was "Le Livre de l'Etudiant," points of view other than the author's own are not more fully recognized. This objection could have been met by a more carefully chosen and critical bibliography, such as the excellent one in Antoine Adam's *Verlaine, l'homme et l'œuvre*, in the same series. The inclusions and the omissions in Ruff's bibliography are almost equally surprising. Probably the most unfortunate omission is that of Henri Peyre's *Connaissance de Baudelaire*, which, among its many admirable qualities, supplies just what Ruff's book lacks, and is to my mind the best introduction to Baudelaire yet written.

MARGARET GILMAN

Bryn Mawr College

REVIEWS IN BRIEF

Les Miracles de Notre Dame par Gautier de Coinci. Publiés par V. Frederic Koenig. Tome premier. Genève: Librairie Droz; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1955. Pp. liii + 177. Gautier de Coinci, author of both lyric and narrative poetry, is beginning at last to receive his due from modern scholars in widely separated lands. Not only have studies and editions of individual works by him been steadily appearing in Finland for some years, but we now have the first volume of a projected complete edition which, though published in Europe, is the work of an American.

Professor Koenig's initial contribution promises well for the future. In a compact introduction he manages to give a comprehensive idea of his author. He lists in order the contents of the two books into which our mediaeval manuscripts usually divide Gautier's works and he cites the more recent editions of each of them. (That of the *Impératrice de Rome* by E. v. Kraemer in *Ann. Acad. Scient. Fenn.*, B. LXXXII, 1953, probably appeared after Koenig's book had gone to press.) He is able to add considerably to Mme. Ducrot-Granderye's excellent bibliography published in 1932. He gives a vivid and understanding account of Gautier's life and discusses in a general way the poet's sources, admitting that a fuller discussion would be impossible within the limits set by his edition and that in this matter the Finnish editions of individual works can be profitably consulted. The difficult problems involved in editing an author whose works are preserved in some eighty manuscripts are frankly faced and reasonably solved. Koenig chooses as his basic text that of a fourteenth century manuscript, *L*, and seems to justify his choice although other scholars have placed more reliance on *N* or *S*. (On p. xxxvii he unfortunately omits the date of *S* which is generally ascribed to the first half of the fourteenth century.) He briefly mentions the linguistic peculiarities of *L* and sensibly summarizes his conclusions regarding the possible relationships that can be detected between various manuscripts, after which he proceeds to establish the principles on which his own edition has been made, wisely disregarding methods that are too mechanical as well as those of the "Bédiéristes à outrance."

This first volume of the new edition contains two of Gautier's prologues, seven lyrical poems and the narrative *Miracle de Théophile*. All are meticulously edited with variants from twenty-seven manuscripts, so that on occasion when a reading may seem strange it can be readily controlled.¹ In some instances the need of a glossary and index of proper names is felt, but for these as well as for notes on the texts and a fuller study of the language and versification we must await the succeeding volumes. May they soon appear—and may they contain the running titles omitted from the present volume! They should prove invaluable to Old French scholars. Meanwhile, a difficult undertaking has been launched in a highly satisfactory manner, with skill, knowledge and good judgment. (GRACE FRANK, *Baltimore, Maryland*)

The Oldest Version of the Twelfth-Century Poem La Venjance Notre Seigneur. Edited by Loyal A. T. Gryting. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Contributions in

1. Only two slips have been noted. On p. 48 read III for I. *Milz*, line 520, p. 82, which is not mentioned among the linguistic peculiarities of *L*, may be a misprint for *mielz* (cf. line 548).

Modern Philology, XIX, 1952. Pp. x + 143. As a first step in his program of presenting eventually a definitive edition of the *VNS*, Gryting has made available the text of MS A (BN fr. 1374), presumably the oldest of the nine surviving MSS containing the French epic stage of this complex and extensive legend. Medievalists will welcome this publication, the more so as the poem has heretofore been printed *in extenso* only on the basis of a late version (Graf).

The problem of laying foundations for the eventual goal is convincingly presented. Then follows a detailed summary of the plot, a study of the language of MS A, exposition of the editorial principles followed, the text of 2368 lines divided into 107 rhymed dodecasyllabic *laissez*, textual notes (with selective index), and bibliographical data.

The textual notes provide ample evidence of the manifold problems faced and, for the most part, ably solved; these notes bespeak close familiarity with the (corrupt) text and a patient search for all available data on difficulties linguistic and literary. Students of other French medieval works should have occasion to consult them frequently. This section, in particular, is written in compact, lively style that contrasts agreeably with the usual pedestrian language characteristic of most editions.

One finds little of consequence to criticize adversely in Gryting's essay on textual criticism. This is all the more remarkable in view of the difficult nature of the task. Contrary to the writers of most doctoral theses, Gryting does not feel it incumbent upon himself to document each statement as if the reader knew nothing of the subject—he keeps constantly in mind the fact he is addressing only a specialized group of scholars. Thus, the reader is left to discover for himself the fact that the poem is written in twelve-syllable lines, he must consult Suchier *et al.* for the respective ages of the MSS, he is left to find himself examples of "occasional Italianisms" (*da* 577, *champaigna* 1257, *aub* 1272, *gloiri* 2367).

Evidence for the date of ca. 1200 seems rather slight. It would be interesting to see the results of a linguistic comparison with other works produced in the reign of Philip Augustus. Should not the linguistic section contain such forms as *besoig* 206, *ben* 208, *men* 278, *man* 560, *box* 805, *chascons* 969, *able* 1388, *quarrel* 1469 *chacon* 1656? It might be fruitful to study the inorganic vowels (Provençal and Anglo-Norman) as in 734, 1079, 1225, 1424, 1429.

In verse 29 it was not necessary to delete the *s* of *Pilate(s) en* for Tobler has shown that an *-e* in spite of inflexional *s* may often elide with the following vowel; cf. also 320, 339, 359, 403, 1241. The word order noted (page 30, number 32) is not so unusual. In view of the statement (page 26) about the weakness of certain final consonants, why restore the *t* of *furent* 61 and other final consonants elsewhere, except possibly when confusion might result in the word intended? *T* was not added to *tan* 484. Are not the forms *proveie* (233), *matinee* (319) found in Eastern texts? For *service* 491, see Roques' edition of *Aucassin* (page XVIII). Why restore the *nasal* in *maintena[n]t* 531? Is *suit* 641 the correct MS reading? There is no cogent reason for changing the MS lesson *tint* 1040. *Qui'n* 1072 might well have been mentioned in the discussion of versification (page 30). It was not necessary to delete *que* 1187 (cf. 1195), nor the *e* in 1708, 2254. For *en serit* 1262, read *ens* (= "dans la campagne" 1257) *erit*? The form *Mahoment* 1294 though lacking in Langlois' *Table des noms propres* . . . has been found several times by me in the unedited *Simon de Pouille*. Page 107, note 34.1, why is it "clear" that the

other MSS have more accurately indicated the original? The sheer weight of MS tradition is not conclusive nor even (to me) compelling and especially so when the MSS are widely spaced in time. A two-verse reading is given for *BCDEI* as opposed to one verse in *A*; what of the other three MSS? Same remark for notes 70.1-2, 903, 944, 989, 1014. The sentence (page 108, note 97) "Incidentally . . ." is not clear. Note 359, such *laisses* occur in *Simon de Pouille*. Note 967 *montarent* and 1117 *alenpantin* might also be provençalisms. Note 1463, such placing of the *cæsura* is common enough in post twelfth-century epics. Note 2198, "stupid" is rather strong; why keep the reading when all other MSS of the group read otherwise? Printing errors: page 29, no. 22, for 2360 read 672; verse 356 (and 1521, 1829), read *L'empereres*; verse 800, for *ne* read *me*; verse 831, replace semicolon by period and place the quote of 832 here; verse 1755, insert question mark after *tue*; verse 1818, for *c'el* read *sel*; verse 2092, for *il ors* read *li ors*; verse 2242, for *L'em[er]ere* read *L'emper[er]ere*; page 103, for 486 read 484; note 1308.1 *nulo* (?); note 1699, for *Pichou* read *Pichon*. (HARRY F. WILLIAMS, *University of California, Los Angeles*)

Les Troubadours. Par Ernest Hoepffner. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1955. Pp. 223. This is a very useful little manual of Provençal literature and should satisfy a real need in the field since the older works of like popularizing nature are out of print. While Hoepffner's work is unpretentious and elementary, it does cover the main aspects of the history of the Troubadour lyric. His chief innovation is to center his attention around individuals rather than genres or chronological periods; this is not particularly difficult to do since the great individual poets from William or Poitou to Guiraut Riquier may be made to exemplify also both varying styles and chronological development. It is to be commended however, I think, as an indirect method of correcting the frequently voiced criticism that all Provençal poets sound alike and blend into a monotonous similarity. Another departure from some of the older manuals lies in a somewhat fuller treatment of the last Troubadours: Guiraut Riquier and Cerveri de Girona. For the rest, Hoepffner's study follows the conventional pattern, summarizing the works of the major poets, citing the names and characteristics of minor figures and providing frequent examples, in the original and translation, of the lyrics themselves. Hoepffner's judgments are in no way unconventional or anti-traditional; the book is of course, *qua* manual, the more useful for that reason. I confess to some feeling of mild disappointment that the bibliography does not contain more of the new works that have appeared in the last twenty years, which have been on the whole surprisingly productive in this field. However as a compact little reference work it does very well and may be recommended as a pleasant introduction to the Provençal lyric. (THOMAS G. BERGIN, *Yale University*)

Alfonso Martínez de Toledo: *Arcipreste de Talavera*. Editado da Mario Penna. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, n.d. Pp. lxxiii + 250. Despite the literary importance of the *Arcipreste de Talavera*, known also as *El Corbacho* since early printings, it still awaits a good critical edition. The work was completed in 1438, when the author was forty years old. The only manuscript known is the one copied by Alonso de Contreras in 1466, when the author was still living. The work was first printed in Seville, 1498; then, Toledo, 1499 and 1500; these editions were not based on the extant manuscript but on some other one now lost. The printed text contains some

materials not found in the manuscript, the most extensive being a tale at the beginning of Part II, about an old man who married a young woman, taken from *Disciplina clericalis*, and a burlesque epistle or *demanda* at the very end of the work. On the other hand, some four hundred lines from the manuscript are missing in the early editions. Whether these differences were due to the whims of the editors or to the manuscripts themselves is a moot question.

These differences were first brought out by Pérez Pastor in his edition of the manuscript, in which he included the additions and a few variants of the two incunabula. His was an edition of 214 numbered copies (Madrid: Bibliófilos Españoles, 1901). The manuscript was faithfully transcribed by Leslie Byrd Simpson and published in 750 copies without critical apparatus (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1931). Simpson's text was utilized by Martín de Riquer in his edition of Barcelona, 1949 (300 numbered copies in *Selecciones Bibliófilas*), who added a brief but satisfactory introduction and a few helpful notes. He also printed as an appendix the final *Demanda* found at the end of the first editions, which he considered apocryphal. He did not pretend to give us a scholarly edition, although for the general reader it is an excellent text, with written accents and modern punctuation. These editions have all become extremely rare; of some not a single copy was available in Italy.

This new edition by Penna, consisting of 1100 numbered copies, comes closer to being a critical edition than any of those published to date. He has profited by the work of previous editors and has tried to supply their deficiencies. Penna reproduces the text of the manuscript and adds the important variants from the Seville edition of 1498, being careful to indicate the folios of both, as preceding editors had not done. He also indicates in parenthesis the material in the manuscript not found in the incunabula. In addition to the variants, he adds many footnotes relating to sources and textual problems. Like his predecessors, Penna modernizes the punctuation and adds written accents.

In his extensive introduction he discusses in some detail matters of language and the sources utilized by Martínez de Toledo. To this effect he follows important recent works by A. Steiger (*Boletín de la Real Acad. Esp.*, 1922, 1923), and Miquel y Planas (*El Espejo de Jaime Roig*, Barcelona, 1936-1942), on the vocabulary of the Arcipreste, and by Erich von Richthofen, (*Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, LXI (1941), on sources. The latter are usually clearly indicated by the author, as was customary in his times. The main source of the Arcipreste for the reproof of worldly love was Book III of *De Amore* by Andrea Capellanus, cited as a "doctor de Paris." This name must have been written in abbreviation in the original text and garbled by the copyists. Contreras transcribed it as "Johan Asim." Penna discusses at some length this confusion, in no way attributable to the author's desire to disguise or conceal his sources, when the opposite was the practice then. He postulates that "capellán Andrea" may have been written *cplā ādā*, taken by the copyists to be *iōhā ansy*, or the "Johan Ausim" of the manuscript and "Johan. Assi" of the Seville incunabula. The hypothesis seems plausible.

As an appendix, the editor prints the Latin text of Book III of Andrea Capellanus' *De Amore*, with indications of the places in the text, where this work is followed, giving in italics the lines that were utilized in the *Arcipreste*. The volume ends with a nine-page vocabulary containing the most unusual words, much more complete and accurate than the one added by Pérez Pastor, who did not even indi-

cate the places in the text where the words appeared. Without being so complete as the vocabulary published by Steiger, it is more detailed for the words listed. There is no separate bibliography, although the works utilized by the editor are fully described in the footnotes.

This is by far the most scholarly and satisfactory edition of the *Arcipreste de Talavera* to date. It is neatly printed, with very few misprints or errors. (AGAPITO REY, *Indiana University*)

Machiavelli AntiCristo. Di Giuseppe Prezzolini. Roma: Gherardo Casini Editore, 1954. Pp. 477. The life of Machiavelli began after his death, says Professor Prezzolini. The "true" Machiavelli is the creative working of his thought on his readers. Whether seen as a mortal or an immortal, Machiavelli appears to me a mixture of scientist, idealist, and satirist. Each of these elements is recognized by Prezzolini, and Prezzolini's own gifts as a satirist might seem to make him especially qualified to analyze this aspect of Machiavelli's writings. But the sections on the comedies and on the ironical tones in Machiavelli's prose are regrettably brief; the satirical element is the least fully described. It is inadequately treated precisely because it is that part of Machiavelli which is almost alive within Prezzolini himself. He loves Machiavelli and attributes to him the mood, the vision, and the skill to which he would himself, it seems, be content to attain. This Machiavelli, the man of keen insights, quick generalizations, and ready wit, is so intensely alive within Prezzolini that he cannot put aside all wittiness, step out of himself, and dissect objectively the Machiavellian mixture of satirist with scientist.

Prezzolini's view of Machiavelli was made clear in his *Vita di Nicolò Machiavelli Fiorentino* published in Italian and English nearly thirty years ago, embodying myths and elaborating them with obvious fictions true to the spirit of Florence. *Machiavelli AntiCristo* is in contrast a work of scholarship, destructive of myths and full of quotations. A preface addressed to the "caro lettore italiano" explains with ingratiating informality that this is an elementary book because it is based on lectures given at Columbia University in America, a country where democracy exists in the sincere effort to proceed at the pace of the slowest soldier in the battalion. The seven parts are devoted to (1) the doctrine, (2) the style and language, (3) the precursors, (4) the works, (5) the life, (6) the friends and contemporaries, and (7) the way Machiavelli and Machiavellianism have been viewed by innumerable writers from his day to ours. Each part is divided into short sections as loosely connected one with another as are the chapters of Machiavelli's Discourses. The volume as a whole is therefore a collection of brief notes which are almost always interesting and presented with verve, but which do not build one upon the other.

In spite of the homage paid to the slowest man in the battalion, the book will be of much interest to those who have completed basic training and are capable of a faster pace. Professor Prezzolini has in fact been doing high level staff work on Machiavelli for many years and *Machiavelli AntiCristo* is the fruit of this extensive reading. His explanation of Machiavelli's realistic indifference towards partisan championship of either republicanism or monarchy is excellent, as are also the passages on nationalism and on Machiavelli's unrealistic attachment to "Italy." There is, it seems to me, one idealistic or unrealistic strain in Machiavelli, which Prezzolini does not discuss—Machiavelli's faith in regulations or institutions. In his *Arte della Guerra* Machiavelli concludes that more men of *virtù* are found in

republics than in monarchies, because in a monarchy *virtù* is feared whereas in a republic it is honored. Machiavelli finds this true only, of course, in a republic that is well organized, *bene ordinata*. *Ordine, ordinare, ordinato* recur so frequently in Machiavelli that they seem to me to deserve more attention in those sections in which Prezzolini analyzes Machiavelli's vocabulary and its meanings. His section on *lo stato* whets the appetite for this kind of analysis but does not satisfy it.

In this respect as in many others, *Machiavelli AntiChristo* achieves admirably its avowed purpose of being a survey which will arouse in readers at all levels curiosity to explore more thoroughly. (FREDERIC C. LANE, *The Johns Hopkins University*)

Bibliographie des œuvres de Clément Marot. Par C. A. Mayer. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1954. Vol. I: *Manuscrits*, pp. 101; Vol. II: *Éditions*, pp. 105. In 1920 and 1921 Pierre Villey published in the *Revue du Seizième Siècle* four substantial articles bearing the collective title "Tableau chronologique des publications de Marot." In the *Avant-propos* of the series he stated: "On ne trouvera pas ici la bibliographie de Marot, qui nous manque encore. La description bibliothechnique des livres est hors de notre sujet . . ." Thanks to the second of Professor Mayer's excellent publications this lack no longer exists, and for good measure he has provided in the first an indispensable companion volume treating in detail the known manuscripts of the poet. Thus M. Mayer brings nearer to fulfillment the promise of the two articles on "Le Texte de Marot" published by him in the *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* in 1952 and 1953, as well as that implied in the earlier work of Villey. The latter had said in 1920: "Des circonstances dans lesquelles ont été publiées les diverses éditions, nous verrons se dégager les desiderata auxquels doit satisfaire une édition critique de l'œuvre de Marot," and he had pointed out the fundamental reason why the Guiffrey edition fell far short of satisfying these desiderata, namely, the haphazard evaluation and employment of the existing manuscripts and editions for the establishment of text and variants.

M. Mayer's aim is to eliminate, as far as circumstances may allow, the element of hazard in fixing the relative authenticity and authoritativeness of the available manuscripts and editions. In this task, he says, "Mon dessein n'est pas de remplacer ici le *Tableau chronologique* de Villey, mais de lui servir de complément" (II, 7).

There can be no question of the validity of M. Mayer's conviction that his *travaux d'approche*, used in conjunction with those of Villey, will greatly facilitate the establishment of a critical edition of Marot.

The problem in the case of Marot is in some respects more complicated than in that of Ronsard. While the latter was, in general, extremely attentive in following his work through the press, Marot was frequently quite indifferent to this aspect of his relation to the reading public. This fact explains the urgency of determining the edition or editions which benefited from the supervision of Marot in their passage through the press. It would be unwise, as M. Mayer points out, to assume that even a manuscript as authoritative as that of the Musée Condé at Chantilly, which Marot had presented to Anne de Montmorency in 1538, necessarily presents a definitive text, for it contains not only manifest errors of the copyist, but transformations of the text made by Marot himself and uniformly dictated by the fact that the recipient was the Constable of France.

For these reasons one can only welcome M. Mayer's great circumspection with respect to the crucial questions of authenticity and authoritativeness of the manuscripts and editions of Marot as a guarantee that the critical edition will rest upon a solid base. (ISIDORE SILVER, *University of Connecticut*)

Ronsard poète de l'amour. Livre II: De Marie à Genevève. Par Fernand Desonay. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1954. Pp. 320. M. Desonay has added a second gracious volume to the promised trilogy on Ronsard, the poet of love. Those who have read the admirable first volume may be assured that the present one takes its place as the equal of the earlier in its mastery of the vast production of Ronsard, in the perfect sincerity of its outlook, and in its poetic attunement to the musical qualities of Ronsard's art.

The new volume maintains the same central thesis as the first, reviewed here in April of last year (pp. 135-41): the Cassandra episode is equated with the decasyllabic sonnet as the expression of the erotic lyricism of the poet's youth, while the Marie episode is identified with the Alexandrine, whose adoption represented an advance toward the triumph of the poetic craft in the writing of Ronsard. It is understandable that with these convictions, the author should see the verses for Cassandra as more natural than those for Marie, and their erotic expression as more intense.

M. Desonay is quite aware that this opinion differs from that of some of the leading students of Ronsard, including Paul Laumonier, Henri Chamard, Raymond Lebègue, and Alexander Micha, who are in unanimous agreement as to the greater simplicity, naturalness, spontaneity, and sincerity of the *Amours* for Marie over those addressed to Cassandra (p. 72, note 46). The author protests that in adopting a position contrary to the received opinion, he is not moved by the spirit of paradox. But in spite of the many truths to be found in M. Desonay's discussion of the *Amours* for Marie, and in spite of the frequent evidence in the verses for Cassandra that one is in the presence of a poet destined to greatness, one remains steadfast in the conviction that the received opinion is, in the present instance, the one that will continue to withstand the test of the centuries. The ground of M. Desonay's argument vanishes for the reader who is able to see how inherently probable it is that Ronsard's initial choice of the decasyllable, like that of Peletier and Du Bellay at the same period, or that of Balf, or Tyard, or indeed that of the aging Clément Marot ten years earlier, was dictated by the desire to introduce the Italian sonnet into France, and not by some personal *mytique* founded on the equation: youth-sensuality-lyricism-Cassandra-decasyllable. Ronsard's later preference for the Alexandrine did not correspond to an idiosyncratic decline in the amorous lyricism of his earlier years, for it was a preference that he shared with many poets of the same period. After 1555, the Alexandrine revealed itself more and more as the meter in which French poets generally felt most at ease. The assignment of a cause, peculiar to Ronsard, for his change from the decasyllable to the Alexandrine, should properly involve the assignment of similarly special reasons for the same change in each of the poets who underwent a similar metrical conversion—an obviously futile perspective for literary history or criticism.

Convinced that the Alexandrine sonnet represents a progress toward the triumph of Ronsard's craftsmanship, M. Desonay, in the interesting and well-documented final chapter, "Ronsard Autocorrecteur," nevertheless develops the theme that in

revising the amorous poetry of 1555 to 1563 in the successive collective editions, "Ronsard a la main malheureuse dans la proportion suivante: comme 7 est à 2." This is a variant of the assertion, heard again and again since the days of Estienne Pasquier (*Recherches de la France*, Book VII, Chap. VI), that Ronsard's old age was characterized by a declining poetic sensibility. It is almost universally agreed, however, that his powers were never higher than they were in 1574, when he wrote the superb composition, "Comme on voit sur la branche au mois de May la rose," and M. Desonay himself regards this as the finest of Ronsard's sonnets. Yet he assures us that the further Ronsard advanced in years toward the full possession of his craft, the more incapable he became of successfully correcting his earlier lyric-erotic poetry: "Ronsard se corrige de plus en plus mal à fur et à mesure qu'il avance en âge . . ." (p. 255)

Only an exhaustive enumeration and study of the countless passages in which Ronsard's variants improve or impair the original lines, would suffice to counterbalance the position adopted by M. Desonay. The brevity of a review excludes such a study, but one may be permitted to quote Paul Laumonier's admirable summation in his *Ronsard poète lyrique* (p. 276) of the esthetic principles that guided the poet in his incessant revisions: "Correction, clarté, plénitude, harmonie, élégance, noblesse et sobriété de forme, telles sont les qualités qu'il a recherchées . . . et cela jusqu'à la fin de son existence." (Laumonier's emphasis.) As to the opinion, current since the sixteenth century, but not stated by M. Desonay in quite these terms, that Ronsard "avait évidemment subi l'influence pernicieuse d'une caducité à la fois physique et intellectuelle," Laumonier says categorically, "Or cette opinion est radicalement fautive" (p. 277). The greatest and not least sensitive student of Ronsard's lyric poetry, who had come to a superlative knowledge of both the substance, and the positive and negative values, of the variants, thus gave renewed expression to the thought uttered by one of the eulogists of the poet in the year that followed his death:

D'un plus clair feu flamboye estant pres de sa fin.¹ (ISIDORE SILVER,
University of Connecticut)

Montesquieu (1689-1755). Exposition organisée à la Bibliothèque municipale pour commémorer le deuxième centenaire de la mort de Montesquieu. Bordeaux: [Published by the] Ville de Bordeaux, mai-juin 1955. Pp. 148. The Exposition and Catalogue are due to the enterprise and knowledge of M. Louis Desgraves, "Conservateur de la Bibliothèque municipale de Bordeaux." They have been preceded by two much briefer catalogues, one of Montesquieu manuscripts prepared by M. André Masson in 1939 and the other in honor of the *Esprit des lois* in 1948, this latter likewise by M. Desgraves. The City of Bordeaux, by its publication of these several catalogues, has shown in tangible and indeed in elegant fashion how much it esteems its great eighteenth-century citizen.

A Preface by M. Julien Cain, "Administrateur général de la Bibliothèque Nationale" at Paris, offers a brief *mise au point* on the background of both Exposition and Catalogue. Eight excellent plates add to the book's value and attractiveness. After a useful Chronology of the author and a listing of Montesquieu manuscripts

1. "Sur le Tombeau de Ronsard," by P. Del-Bene, p. 113 of the *Discours de la Vie de Pierre de Ronsard . . . ensemble son Tombeau . . .* (Paris: Buon, 1586).

owned by the Library at Bordeaux, the larger part of the book comprises seven sections devoted to different periods or aspects of the writer's life and works.

There are notations of books owned or used by the proprietor of La Brède, descriptions of his separate or collected works, quotations of opinions regarding himself, on others, or on life in general, and many helpful bibliographical indications. At the end (pp. 139-44) appears a useful list of 116 titles bringing the active Montesquieu bibliography up to the date of publication. To it should be added the important work by Paul M. Spurlin on *Montesquieu in America* (Louisiana State University Press, 1940), which is lacking no doubt because it appeared in this country during the years when France was largely closed to the outside world on account of the War.

This book is more than an austere repertory of information about Montesquieu. In many quotations, the man himself appears. He can understand and sympathize with his downtrodden peasants: "Mes métayers de La Brède," he writes, "ont été si fort chargés de taille qu'il est impossible qu'ils la paient; il faudroit qu'ils vendissent tout leur blé. Je vous prie de parler aux collecteurs et de les engager à les soulager" (p. 35). At the same time, with his firm sense of property, he lashes out pitilessly and indeed inhumanly against poachers: "Les braconniers chassent sur nos terres; ces vagabonds sont sans respect pour les propriétés et, malgré les précautions que l'on prend, ils dévastent et font cent fois plus de mal à nos moissons que les renards et les blaireaux; on sera bientôt obligé de tendre des pièges pour diminuer l'espèce de ces animaux bipèdes, qui mettent tout à feu et à sang" (ibid.). Montesquieu records his exact observations through the microscope (p. 55). A letter from Cardinal Fleury to Claude Boucher, Intendant of Guienne, criticizes Montesquieu in 1737 for being a Mason (p. 91). Many other interesting passages might be cited.

The volume is attractively printed and presented. It constitutes an indispensable compact source of information about Montesquieu and his works. Both M. Desgraves and the City of Bordeaux are to be congratulated on its publication. (GEORGE R. HAVENS, *Ohio State University*)

Montesquieu: *Lettres persanes*. Edition critique avec notes par Antoine Adam. (Textes Littéraires Français) Genève: Librairie Droz; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1954. Pp. xxviii + 434. The text of the *Lettres Persanes* adopted by M. Adam is that of the Richer edition of the *Œuvres* published in 1758. He gives the variants of the first, second and 1754 editions, and those of Barckhausen's edition which respects Montesquieu's final manuscript revisions. There are 161 letters, one more than in the editions of Barckhausen and the other editors who have adopted his text. In such editions, Letter 145 is relegated to the Appendix for the reason, now considered insufficient by M. Caillols and M. Adam, that Montesquieu omitted it from the list of letters to be inserted in the definitive edition. The Appendix, consisting of rejected Persian letters and fragments of letters, comprises two new texts: a Persian letter found in the archives of La Brède by M. Louis Desgraves and published by M. André Masson in *Mercur de France*, Jan. 1, 1954, and a fragment from the *Pensées* identified by M. Adam as part of a Persian letter. M. Adam's edition therefore includes what now definitely constitutes the complete text of the *Lettres persanes*.

In a very compact introduction of less than twenty pages, M. Adam first pre-

sents the essential facts about the conception, composition, publication, editions, corrections and fragments of the *Lettres*; then he discusses the previous Oriental fictions, the sources of the Oriental background, the shortcomings of the fiction as a novel, the dating of the letters, Montesquieu's ideas and their sources, and his qualities as an observer of manners and literary artist. M. Adam's annotations are an improvement over the best previous commentary, that of Carcassonne. He adds many new notes concerning the Oriental background, the satire of French society and the most important ideas in the *Lettres persanes*.

The facts leading M. Adam to conclude that the work was composed not long before its publication, can be supported by internal evidence. The suggestion that the much-discussed second edition represents a stage of the text older than that of the first edition is quite plausible. M. Adam rightly stresses that Marana's *Espion turc* was Montesquieu's real model, but he states too positively the probability that Montesquieu knew the obscure *Lettres à Musala*. The two paragraphs listing the sources of the Oriental background are inadequate and do not accurately assess Montesquieu's borrowings. In the notes, M. Adam needlessly quotes from authors who report the same facts as Chardin, Tavernier and others who surely influenced Montesquieu and should therefore be given preference in such cases. In borrowing the names of the Moslem months from Chardin, Montesquieu did not, as M. Adam says, change the name of the month *Cheval* to *Chalval*; this form is also found in Chardin (cf. III, 89, of 1711 3 vol. ed.). It is only fair in this connection to point out that long ago Hermann Gäbler in *Studien zu Montesquiueus Persischen Briefen* (1898), indicated Montesquieu's debt to Chardin for the names of the Moslem months and correctly worked out Montesquieu's system of dates, though not as thoroughly as Prof. R. Shackleton in a recent article utilized by M. Adam. The intellectual climate which fostered some of Montesquieu's important ideas is accurately defined; but M. Adam did not have much of the evidence that will make possible a definite and complete appraisal of this aspect of Montesquieu's fiction. Among the authors cited as influences on Montesquieu's thought are Descartes, Bayle, Fontenelle, Malebranche and Shaftesbury. Montesquieu is more heavily indebted to them and to others not mentioned than appears from M. Adam's commentary. M. Adam is much more successful in showing how well-founded and justified the satire is, by utilizing, more than previous editors have done, letters, memoirs, travel accounts and satirical works of Montesquieu's epoch.

Some of the notes are only vaguely useful, as for example the one to this passage of Letter 59: "On a dit fort bien que, si les triangles faisoient un dieu, ils lui donneroient trois côtés." M. Adam quotes a text on anthropomorphism from Spinoza's *Tractatus*. But the exact source is found in one of Spinoza's letters published in the *Opera posthuma* (1677): "Haec non miror, quia credo, quod triangulum, siquidem loquendi haberet facultatem, eodem modo diceret, Deu eminentem triangularem esse . . ." (*Opera*, ed. van Vloten et Land, Epistola LVI). The notes to many other letters are inadequate or not completely satisfactory and several letters, needing explication, have not been annotated at all.

A thorough commentary of the *Lettres* would require the systematic reading of the many books that Montesquieu could have known, many of the works written by his contemporaries, and all the relevant studies not utilized by M. Adam. Until such a commentary is published, however, he deserves our gratitude for having solved a few more problems concerning Montesquieu's sources of inspiration, given

a better understanding of many passages of the *Lettres*, and especially for having made available, in an easily obtainable separate edition, the text of this significant work.

Misprints, all in the notes, are found on pp. xiii, xvi, 146, 149, 204, 220, 247, 254, 266, 321, 332, 387. (ALESSANDRO S. CRISAFULLI, *The Catholic University of America*)

Marivaux par lui-même. Par Paul Gazagne. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1954. Pp. 190. The growing popularity of Marivaux has brought forth many publications about him since the war. Now Paul Gazagne gives a novel turn to Marivaux studies in his profusely illustrated *Marivaux par lui-même*.

M. Gazagne has developed a curious thesis about the "surprises de l'amour" and the heroines therein. For over two centuries, the Silvias, the Comtesses, the Aramintes of Marivaux's comedies have generally been considered as charming, well-bred young women, caught at the moment of the play in a delightful encounter with awakening love. But for M. Gazagne, "la surprise de l'amour" is in reality "la surprise du désir" and he claims that "Les meilleures comédies de Marivaux sont celles où règne la sensualité" (p. 110), and he ascribes to the heroines an aggressive propensity for voluptuous adventure. In *Le Jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, he strips Silvia of maidenly restraint and asserts that "elle était décidée à devenir la maîtresse du valet". When Dorante reveals his identity and Silvia realizes the sincerity of his devotion to her, she sighs with infinite gratitude, "Allons, j'avais grand besoin que ce fût là Dorante," because it releases her from what seemed to be a bewildering and humiliating situation. But M. Gazagne believes the worst of Silvia: "Si le domestique n'avait pas été Dorante, Silvia l'aurait sans doute épousé sans cérémonie" (p. 110). Likewise, he imputes intemperate instincts to Araminte in *Les Fausses Confidences*. Upon her first entrance, she asks Marton who the young man on the terrace is. M. Gazagne construes this innocent question as prompted by amorous impulsion. Hardly on the stage five seconds, he says, "elle songe au plaisir qu'elle pourrait trouver dans ses bras" (p. 114). From this point on, he analyses each scene between Araminte and Dorante in terms of primitive lust. If anyone should still find a remnant of goodness in these heroines, M. Gazagne insists that a play "paraît chaste parce que la vertu ne succombe pas avant la chute du rideau: aurait-elle été victorieuse si la comédie avait duré un quart d'heure de plus?" (p. 111). Far from seeing the wholesome "sentiers du cœur" for which Marivaux is famed, M. Gazagne sees only broad highways of sensuality. In time, this mania to divest Marivaux's heroines of their individuality and charm becomes exasperating. Few readers are likely to accept these oblique concepts as valid interpretations.

In discussing Marivaux's life, the author adopts some untenable hypotheses. Biographical facts concerning Marivaux are exceedingly limited. So M. Gazagne attempts to supplement the facts by selecting excerpts from Marivaux's writing which he claims to be autobiographical; he intertwines them with the facts and thereby creates a picture which may or may not be true. He attributes to Marivaux a succession of amorous liaisons, starting with "maintes capricieuses aventures avant de se marier" (p. 51). He takes issue with D'Alembert's statement that "Marivaux fut inconsolable de la perte de sa femme" and imagines that "Marivaux veuf a pu rencontrer, dans un salon ou au théâtre, une femme qui l'a tenté, malgré

la douce mémoire qu'il gardait de son épouse" (p. 53)—hence, Marivaux's defense of "l'union libre" a few years later in *L'Île de la raison*. (As a matter of fact, Marivaux does not preach free love, but rather marriage by public consent on an honorable basis.) And still later, he argues that Marivaux was too young at fifty-six to enter into a platonic association with Mlle de Saint-Jean. With the same sort of arbitrary speculation, M. Gazagne has chosen a passage which for him represents the true relationship between Marivaux and his mother on the grounds that "la confidence est trop précise pour ne point correspondre à des instants vécus" (p. 51).

None of these assumptions can be proved. The obvious weakness of this method is that other critics could choose other passages from Marivaux's writings and reconstruct still other pictures of Marivaux—all equally false. As of this moment, much of Marivaux's life must remain in obscurity until further discoveries are made.

On the other hand, M. Gazagne defends Marivaux vigorously against the accusation of *marivaudage*, although he himself indulges in affectation to explain the origin of the word. Thereafter, M. Gazagne logically and convincingly refutes the traditional criticisms which have been leveled at Marivaux.

In the realm of social and moral ideas, M. Gazagne believes that "Marivaux a droit à une des premières places parmi les moralistes français" (p. 131), a view held by most critics. He documents his statements with quotations not only from the plays and novels, but from the journals and heretofore little known fragmentary articles as well, giving Marivaux due credit for innovations in thinking with regard to the emancipation of women and the responsibilities of statesmen. Too, he finds in Marivaux's writing an early expression of the doctrine of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Make no mistake about it, M. Gazagne is a Marivaux devotee. His book is written with sparkle and gusto. However, in spite of the vast knowledge which the author displays, this is not *un livre d'érudition*: it has no notes, references or index; the bibliography is scant; facts and dates are faulty here and there. One can readily pardon minor inaccuracies, but it is difficult to sanction willful distortions. At times, M. Gazagne seems to have indulged in dilettante improvisation for his own pleasure. (KENNETH N. MCKEE, *New York University*)

New Letters of David Hume. Edited by Raymond Klibansky and Ernest C. Mossner. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954. Pp. xxxiv + 253. *The Life of David Hume*. By Ernest Campbell Mossner. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1954. Pp. xx + 683. It is a strange coincidence that all Hume's major biographers should at the same time have contributed substantially to our first-hand knowledge of the philosopher by publishing his correspondence almost simultaneously with their biography: after John Hill Burton's publications of over a century ago, Professor J. Y. T. Greig brought out in 1932 two large volumes of *Letters of David Hume*, which were to form the definitive edition of his correspondence. The previous year, he had published an extremely well written account of the philosopher's life, which owed its excellence perhaps more to the writer's talent than to its scholarly quality. In 1954, with the two volumes now before us, the process has once more repeated itself, although its center of gravity has been shifted.

In the *New Letters of David Hume*, the editors were confronted by the difficult problem of the numerous letters which had previously been reproduced only from

printed sources in a more or less faulty or fragmentary form. The additional letters discovered during the last twenty years have been bolstered with a number of reports written by Hume as British chargé d'affaires in Paris, and if these are not, strictly speaking, personal letters, their inclusion has the advantage of giving us in one volume the most complete record of Hume's diplomatic activities to date.

The new volume shows Hume to have been as solicitous as ever in the service of his friends and admirably tolerant of the views of others, even if formulated in express opposition to his own. The letters also add to our knowledge of the Rousseau quarrel, above all the subsequent correspondence with Davenport, which outlines an interesting evolution in Hume's judgment of his former protégé. The only contribution to a study of Hume's ideas is found in two or three important letters to other historians, which reveal some of his major concepts and stress the preponderant significance which in his later years he attached to his historical work.

Professor Mossner's *Life of David Hume* is by virtue of its completeness a much more substantial contribution to our knowledge of Hume than are the *New Letters*. The author, who in 1943 published a highly entertaining account of Hume's personal relations with some famous and some obscure fellow writers in *The Forgotten Hume* (New York: Columbia University Press), and who has contributed a large number of articles on the philosopher to the learned journals over a period of fifteen years, has long been known as the foremost contemporary authority on Hume's life. He is therefore better qualified than any other living scholar to integrate all his earlier findings, as well as those of others, in one major work. His admirably painstaking account embraces virtually the whole of Scottish intellectual life and its chief protagonists during the age of the Enlightenment, and Hume emerges as the principal champion of all that the eighteenth century stood for. It is pardonable that in his enthusiasm the author has perhaps given more than his due to Hume, proclaiming him, as he does, "the most authentic voice of the Enlightenment" (what of Voltaire, Diderot, or Lessing?), while he treats his contemporaries south of the Tweed rather slightly.

In view of Hume's own estimate and of the echo aroused by his works during his lifetime, it is understandable that far more space should be devoted to his economic and historical writings than to his philosophy. The latter is discussed only insofar as it is necessary to an understanding of Hume's life and relationship with his contemporaries, and here we find the very crux of Professor Mossner's concept of his function as a biographer. It explains the curious fact that a great deal is said about the circumstances surrounding the publication of the *Treatise of Human Nature* and the lack of response on the part of the public at home and abroad, and virtually nothing about its contents. The far less significant *Abstract*, however, with which Hume followed it in order to defend his main tenets against his critics, is given detailed consideration because it formed part of Hume's publicity campaign. Similarly, the place of his *History of England* in the evolution of historical writing is hardly discussed, but the external events accompanying its publication are once more beautifully brought out with the aid of much unpublished material. Generally speaking, it may be said that the book is much richer in providing information than in evaluating it, and usually the author presents us with all the ascertainable facts, leaving it to the future student to draw his own conclusions. Thus we still have no altogether satisfactory explanation of Hume's mysterious and vehement disavowal of the *Treatise* during his later years.

Professor Mossner's vivid sense of the dramatic has inspired some of the most exciting chapters of the work, such as the account of the events surrounding Hume's youthful letter to a physician, that of his failure to secure a chair at Edinburgh, and the moving story of his last illness and death. If the continuity of the narrative sometimes almost breaks down in a sequence of anecdotes, this may be regrettable from an aesthetic point of view, but the student of Hume's life can only applaud the scrupulousness of the biographer, who does not permit himself to interweave the facts with fiction. In his desire to be complete, however, Professor Mossner occasionally loses sight of his focal point.

Hume's French contemporaries get their full share of attention from Professor Mossner, and while the relative importance of Mme de Boufflers as a *salonnière* seems exaggerated, we cannot reasonably underestimate the part she played in Hume's later life, and a long and fascinating chapter deals with their relationship. It is hardly possible to quarrel with the author's insistence on the probable intimacy of their relations, but it should be pointed out that the English translation of the passages quoted from the letters of the Countess to the philosopher has a more passionate ring than do the French originals. The discussion of the quarrel with Rousseau, to which Professor Mossner had given considerable space in his *Forgotten Hume*, is moderate and judicious, although naturally somewhat partial to Hume.

Although the modern reader may find that relatively too much space is devoted to such side issues as Hume's position in the Ossianic controversy and not enough to a determination of his precise place in the history of ideas, the great Scotsman, who always regarded himself primarily as a man of letters, would probably have considered this book as an eminently faithful and sympathetic account of his life and aspirations. (PAUL H. MEYER, *University of Connecticut*)

The Age of Ideas: From Reaction to Revolution in Eighteenth-Century France. By George R. Havens. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1955. Pp. ix + 474. The concentrated effort of the author and publisher of this book was to reach the layman, member of that broad reading public which seems often hardly to exist, but which might be nurtured and developed if offered a palatable diet. Ideas are not presented here in the abstract—this is no book of "isms"; they are crystallized as they emerge from the works of the individual creative imagination which alone gives them life and being. Handsome illustrations also add greatly to the attractiveness and interest of the volume.

Previous historians of ideas are responsible for the quite mistaken notion that eighteenth-century France was an age of abstract ideas, and that its eminent literary figures were interested only in man, not in men. Daniel Mornet, for example, in his widely read *French Thought in the Eighteenth Century* speaks of the Voltaires, the Rousseaus, the Diderots—as if these men had not been blessed, or cursed, each with a unique individuality. Cassirer divides his chapters according to the subdivisions of systematic philosophy.

Professor Havens' greatest merit lies therefore in his method. "Ideas live only in people," he writes in his Introduction; "for this reason, it is natural not to separate in this book the course of ideas from the vivid personalities who gave them birth." And what is not natural leads to distortion. There was of course a climate of opinion, a background of commonly accepted ideas which can be generalized. The interest of distinction lies elsewhere. Professor Havens, through biographical

sketches and analyses of literary masterpieces, reveals the intensity of the fired creative imagination of the great writers of the age, in a story that contains no tedious moment. The emphasis on literary works proclaims once again that literature is the queen of the humanities.

The very order and proportions of the book preserve the drama of the century that began with the revocation of the *Edit de Nantes* and ended in revolution. Although Professor Havens does not insist, it is readily apparent that the causes of that Revolution were mainly economic and political. Seen in that light, against Louis XIV's legacy of bankruptcy and inevitable decay, the great figures of the century are seen as the builders of a new order: Montesquieu, disciple of Bayle in his plea for toleration, devised the necessary legal limits of absolute power; Voltaire consistently championed the freedoms of the human spirit that were to be incorporated in the *Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen*; Rousseau spectacularly proclaimed the essential sovereignty of the people. Only an insistence on Locke's principle of self-government was lacking to form the future democratic state. When, after the "Explosion" so skillfully illustrated through the life and works of Beaumarchais, Louis XVI finally paid the bill, it was in settlement of the debt left by his great-great-great grandfather, Louis XIV.

Among the early chapters, the abuse of absolute power is most convincingly portrayed in the pages of Fénelon's *Telemachus* and his impassioned *Letter to Louis XIV*. Bayle's broadly conceived views of religious toleration, wrung from personal experience of persecution, pervade the pages of his dictionary, often under cover of a deceptive pyrrhonism. Fontenelle wittily popularized the new scientific spirit, enemy of all dogmatisms even that of science itself. Chapters are then devoted to Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*, bold and biting satire of the relaxed social life under the Regency, and his more serious and fundamental *Spirit of Laws*. The following chapter on "Montesquieu in America" is justified in view of the audience which the author is addressing and of its too common omission from our American history books. As usual, Professor Havens has drawn upon the best authorities.

Those who are acquainted with his scholarly work on Voltaire and Rousseau, especially his studies and texts of *Candide* and the *Discourse on the Sciences and the Arts*, will not be surprised at his masterly handling of those geniuses. Scholarly profundity, however, never breaks the smooth flow of the narrative and is as unobtrusive as the notes, which are gathered at the end, without numerical references in the text. Skillfully selected passages from the *Letters on the English*, *Candide*, and the *Philosophical Dictionary* illustrate different facets and epochs of Voltaire's thought. Rousseau is treated sympathetically, always in view of the profit that may be derived today from his major works and ideas. Diderot takes his merited place at last with the giants of his age, not only as an Encyclopedist, but as a stimulating drama and art critic, a philosopher in whom the scientific and poetic imaginations were perfectly blended, and a novelist who created the most original of eighteenth-century characters, the nephew of Rameau. The literary history ends with Figaro and his creator, Beaumarchais, purveyor of arms to the American revolutionists and jack of all trades.

Professor Havens expands with evident sympathy, but with consummate tact and judgment, the thought of this age which Albert Guerard has so aptly called the Greater Renaissance. It was in many respects the finest flowering of the Classi-

cal tradition, a link to that past, which, Professor Havens notes, "is prolonged into the present and offers us our only guide toward the future." In writing a book for all categories of readers, he has achieved the well-nigh impossible. It is a record of civilization which, in its breadth of interest and subject-matter, can be used with profit in the classroom or read for pure delight by the most unacademically-minded. It could offend only those who do not believe in a government of free people or in the essential freedoms necessary for the full development of the human spirit. (N. L. T.)

Une Irlandaise libérale en France sous la Restauration: Lady Morgan, 1775-1859. Par Marcel Ian Moraud. (Etudes de Littérature Etrangère et Comparée) Paris: Librairie Marcel Didier, 1954. Pp. 208. The present study concerns itself with Lady Morgan's role as an observer and apologist of the France of the Restoration, and with the controversies which her commentaries provoked on both sides of the Channel, aspects of her long and colorful career to which previous biographers have given inadequate treatment. In view of the numerous references to Lady Morgan as an intermediary between France and England which have appeared in recent studies of political, social and literary relations between the two countries, it is surprising that such a conspicuous and controversial figure should not sooner have become the subject of a detailed study.

Moraud points out that Lady Morgan was one of the most observant, open-minded and favorably disposed of the innumerable British travellers who hastened to visit France after the long interruption of friendly relations occasioned by Revolution and Empire. The panorama of the Restoration which she presented as a result of her three visits between 1816 and 1830 was consequently by far the most searching and generally informative presented by any foreign observer of the period. If the enthusiastic welcome with which Lady Morgan was received in political, literary and artistic, as well as purely social circles, recalls the warm reception given Horace Walpole in the previous century, her penetrating analyses of the fundamental traits of the French and her perceptive commentaries upon the political climate of what she insisted upon calling *le retour de l'Ancien Régime* are again and again reminiscent of the insight into national character and the prophetic vision with which De Tocqueville portrayed the American scene of about the same period.

The liberalism of Lady Morgan's political views and her courage in expressing them, her tactlessness in repeating the most casual or confidential remarks, and her lack of discrimination in quoting duchesses and laundresses as equally valid authorities, aroused the shocked indignation of those in ultra-conservative Royalist-Catholic circles who had opened their doors—and minds—to her so freely in 1816. As she was driven by their ostracism into more liberal and intellectual groups during her second and third visits in France, her later publications lost something of the pretentiousness and superficiality which did much to obscure the real value of her first book on France.

Novelist of small talent and less originality, she scarcely deserved the title of "Corinne, the Irish Mme de Staël," frequently bestowed upon her during a much earlier period. The title of "Muse romantique" conferred by her French admirers was even more of a misnomer: anything but a Romantic by nature, she was an enemy of classicism largely through her complete inability to appreciate the merits

of French classical authors in general—and of Racine in particular—and through her violent prejudice against any product of the Ancien Régime. Moraud's study goes far to substitute for the traditional portrait of Lady Morgan as a minor Romantic novelist and poet, as one of England's first conspicuously successful blue-stockings and as a spirited champion of political liberalism a more accurate and significant conception of her as an eloquent spokesman in England for a new and liberal France which was more the product of Napoleonic reform and reconstruction than of Revolutionary violence.

Inasmuch as the study was begun in 1939 and, as the author modestly puts it, "a été interrompue par des événements encore présents dans les esprits, et par six années de service dans des milieux ne laissant pas de loisir pour les recherches littéraires," it is perhaps only natural that it should be somewhat uneven in treatment, that it should suggest alluring subjects for further inquiry without attempting to follow them up, and that its documentation—and proofreading—should leave something to be desired. As instances in point, the treatment of Sydney Owenson's early life (Chapters I-III, pp. 15-59) seems so detailed as to be somewhat out of focus in a study of this length; the statements that Stendhal derived certain of the ideas which reappeared in his *Racine et Shakespeare* from Lady Morgan's *France*, and that her famous comparison between the two dramatists and her criticism of French classical tragedy "ont porté un coup sérieux au prestige du classicisme en France et fait progresser la cause romantique" (p. 11) would appear to call for further documentation or fuller discussion; the frequency with which biographical material is drawn from Lady Morgan's own accounts, quite patently arranged to present a flattering picture, rather than from more reliable sources, raises certain doubts as to the accuracy of the facts—as well as to the author's own credulity; and the listing of a score or so of "Journaux et revues s'étant occupés de Lady Morgan" (p. 196) is an unsatisfactory substitute for citing at least the more significant of the many articles on her which appeared in these and other periodicals. As the text itself and the bibliography (pp. 193-199) give abundant evidence of the author's familiarity with a wide range of materials bearing directly and indirectly upon his subject, it is to be regretted that his footnotes, meagerly used and carelessly styled, should give such an incomplete indication of the real scope of his research. Furthermore, his practice of quoting excerpts in French from English titles, without indicating whether or not the translation is his own, seems questionable, particularly in those instances where one or several translations of varying accuracy appeared in France and served as a basis for contemporary discussion.

These, however, are defects of form rather than of content, and are no doubt attributable to the author's haste in completing a study too long under way, rather than to insufficient investigation. They mar, without seriously impairing, the originality and value of a study which has the great merit of rounding out a hitherto incomplete and somewhat distorted picture of a minor figure in English letters who made a major contribution to Anglo-French understanding. (THOMAS R. PALFREY, *Northwestern University*)

Victor Hugo: *Journal 1830-1848*. Publié par H. Guillemin. Paris: Gallimard, 1954. Pp. 382. In this volume M. Guillemin has republished the texts of *Choses vues* for the period 1830-1848, reestablishing them in their correct chronological order and adding to them sentences and paragraphs which Gustave Simon had omitted from his edition. The omissions, which were, indeed, numerous were not in general

extremely serious. They were mostly trivialities, off-color remarks or anecdotes, indiscreet but rarely important comments on Hugo's contemporaries. Nevertheless Guillemin has done well to publish the "texte intégral" and to reestablish the exact chronological order. Here and there, something important emerges. For instance, in the "Funérailles de Napoléon" (*Choses vues*, I, 47) we read: "Le *Requiem*, de Mozart, a fait peu d'effet. Belle musique, déjà ridée. Hélas! la musique se ride!" Guillemin gives the complete paragraph: "Le *Requiem*. . . Hélas! la musique se ride; c'est à peine un art." The final phrase certainly seems to justify those (like Julien Benda) who claim that Hugo had no appreciation of music.

Hugo's generosity of spirit (contested by some) is revealed in a brief paragraph, dated Jan. 30, 1848, omitted by Simon, now published by Guillemin: "Lamartine a fait hier un magnifique discours à la Chambre des députés sur le sujet que j'ai manqué, l'Italie."

All things considered, this volume, while not startling in its revelations, is a useful publication. (ELLIOTT M. GRANT, *Williams College*)

Temas de Unamuno. Por Carlos Clavería. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1953. Pp. 156. The five essays brought together in this new volume of the *Biblioteca Románica Hispánica* have already been published separately: two in Spain, two in the United States, and one in Mexico. Except for the inclusion of new bibliography in the footnotes, they have not been significantly modified since their first appearance, but the convenience of having them all together justifies their republication. The following paragraphs merely suggest the aspects of Unamuno's life and works which Professor Clavería has sought to illuminate.

The first essay is called "Unamuno y Carlyle." It begins by reminding the reader of Unamuno's early translation of the *History of the French Revolution* and then goes on to assess Unamuno's debt to Carlyle both by considering what Unamuno himself wrote about Carlyle and by considering the reflections of Carlyle's style and ideas in Unamuno's writings. Some of these reflections are: his fondness for popular and even dialectical words, his penchant for neologisms and hyphenated words, his inclination visibly to walk among his characters, his interest in the concrete man of flesh and bone, his concern with the theme of eternity (*eternismo*).

The second essay is entitled "Unamuno y la 'enfermedad de Flaubert.'" The nature of this affliction of Flaubert is best recalled by applying to him the well-known sentence he wrote of Bouvard and Pécuchet: "Then a pitiable faculty developed in their spirit, that of perceiving stupidity and no longer tolerating it." In his works Unamuno demonstrated that he too suffered from this pitiable faculty. And his suffering was provoked not by human stupidity alone but also by the possible implications of his own attitude toward it. In this connection he remembered more than once what Saint Matthew had said of him who called his brother a fool. Obviously, Unamuno did not borrow from Flaubert his attitude toward stupidity, but by reading Flaubert he probably learned to refine his understanding of it and to see its literary possibilities.

The third essay, "Sobre el tema de Caín en la obra de Unamuno," stresses the importance of the biblical theme of Cain and Abel in Unamuno's fiction and in his interpretation of Spanish character and the troubled history of modern Spain. One interesting way in which it differs from the first two essays is in its attention to matters of literary methodology, particularly to that of the Germans.

The fourth and fifth essays are slighter than the first three. Number four, "Notas

italianas en la 'estética' de Unamuno," suggests certain areas of what Mr. Clavería calls *congenialidad* which Unamuno discovered in the *Aesthetics* of Benedetto Croce, in the poetry of Leopardi, and, to a lesser extent, in a number of English poets. Perhaps it is fair to let essay number five, "Don Miguel y la luna," be represented here by its conclusion only: "Don Miguel de Unamuno es un ejemplo de hombre que filosofó, vivió y poetizó *so la luna*. Mirando a la luna, bajo ella, iluminado su espíritu por su pálido esplendor de esperanza, se fué fraguando mucho de su pensamiento y de su obra." One may surmise that the light of the moon is no paler than any lasting hope derived by Unamuno from the contemplation of that heavenly body.

Professor Clavería has done more than contribute to our understanding of Unamuno in the areas indicated. By means of numerous footnotes he has put us in touch with other relevant studies of Unamuno and with studies of other men and themes related in one way or another to his subject. His footnotes suggest also some aspects of Unamuno still in need of investigation. By tracing certain themes through a wide variety of Unamuno's works, Professor Clavería allows us to see what truth there is in thinking that these works are but a long confession. Like many other studies of Unamuno, Professor Clavería's, directly or indirectly, touch questions beyond those proposed. One such question, inevitable in dealing with the Salamancan philosopher, is that of the existence and workings of God. Since Mr. Clavería did not undertake to study this matter, he cannot fairly be reproached for not having gone into it profoundly. I mention it merely to make an opportunity for stating what I believe is now most urgently needed for a deeper understanding of Unamuno.

The central problems of Unamuno's thought are surrounded by contradictions and paradoxes. Perhaps no other great writer has exploited them so consciously and consistently. This trait makes it possible for a critic to choose either side of a contradiction and support it with abundant quotations from Unamuno's writings or to conclude that both sides taken together best represent the agonizing nature of his thought. It is possible, however, to believe that in Unamuno there are zones of deliberate ambiguity, that he speaks many a personal truth in jest, that he makes many a confession through the mouths of others, that he drowns many a painful idea in a sea of words. If this is true, as I believe it is, then there is hope that new light may be focused on the most intimate workings of his mind by a systematic study of the peculiar features of his style. This, it seems to me, is the most promising field awaiting thorough study. (R. L. PREDMORE, *Duke University*)

Supplément bibliographique à l'Introduction à la linguistique française, 1947-1953. Par R.-L. Wagner. Société de Publications romanes et françaises, xlvii. Genève: Droz-Lille: Giard, 1955. Pp. 72. Ce *Supplément* ne se contente pas de mettre à jour la bibliographie de l'*Introduction* de 1947; il présente des vues originales et fécondes. La *bibliographie*, choisie pour les étudiants français, sera tout aussi utile à l'étudiant américain. L'auteur fait la part large à l'érudition américaine encore trop peu connue en France, répare quelques oublis pour la période antérieure à 1947, signale les comptes-rendus parus en 1954; le dépouillement des revues est élargi. Un index des noms d'auteurs est une utile addition: je souhaite que la suite promise comprenne un index des sujets et problèmes qui pallierait la rigidité des cadres de l'exposé et les dispersions que cause son caractère dogmatique (par

exemple, deux articles d'Ullmann qui se complètent sont séparés en III, B et C; y faire figurer dans l'ordre alphabétique les parties du discours permettrait de plier l'exposé aux exigences d'une description structurale rigoureuse restée incomplète pour ne pas déconcerter l'étudiant). Il est difficile de reprocher des omissions à un auteur qui se limite ouvertement: mais certaines exclusives comme celle jetée à la stylistique risquent de donner une fausse idée de la fécondité de certains champs d'étude. Ailleurs, la liste lexicale (pp. 36-40), incomplète dans ses limites mêmes (elle devrait d'ailleurs dépouiller les *Mélanges*), trop touffue, serait utilement remplacée, selon les principes du chapitre *Phonétique*, par quelques monographies typiques (par exemple sur *mediocrilas* ou *ramponé* p. 39 ou l'ouvrage récent de L. Tinsley sur *Spirituality and Devotion*).

L'*Introduction* justifie un classement des faits linguistiques, dont l'auteur cherche les principes dans la langue même, et discute le sens de termes comme *morphologie* et *syntaxe*; il ne s'agit pas d'une querelle d'étiquettes; Henri Poincaré notait naguère qu'un classement nouveau était générateur de découvertes en mathématiques; il en est de même ici: les faits s'éclairent lorsqu'ils ne sont plus contraints dans des cadres d'où ils débordaient par une série d'exceptions désordonnées (voir Pp. 14-15 sur l'article). M. Wagner redéfinit la structure en fonction de l'esprit, souligne l'importance des travaux de G. Guillaume, écarte de la syntaxe les formes qui ne dépendent pas dans leur valeur d'un ensemble (p. 14). A ce propos, l'intonation (p. 16) ne me semble pas pouvoir être comprise dans la syntaxe, précisément parce que l'opposition ne joue pas dans le syntagme, mais à l'intérieur de la série des diverses intonations possibles au même point.

L'intonation résulte d'un choix, matière de style. Mais M. Wagner dénie la possibilité d'une stylistique: les définitions qu'on en propose, dit-il, n'ont pas de trait commun, ce qui est inexact (cf. l'article de Hatzfeld, *YFS*, 2, 1, 62-70 ou la *Stylistique* de Guiraud), bien qu'assurément il y ait des gens pour mélanger syntaxe et stylistique, stylistiques normative et descriptive. M. Wagner doute de la possibilité d'une science générale des faits de style, ceux-ci étant des cas particuliers qui n'auraient de général que les lois psychologiques. Mais la langue elle-même, nous ne la connaissons que par l'étude du fait particulier—*hic et nunc*—de la parole: s'ensuit-il qu'il faille renoncer à la linguistique? La parole a des constantes: de même le style (cf. M. Wagner lui-même, *Introduction à l'Esthétique de la langue* de Gourmont, 1955, p. vi). Celui-ci ne pourrait se définir qu'à partir de l'état de la langue et du sens intime d'un écrivain donné (pp. 9-10): ce sont, en effet, des faits particuliers, mais les oppositions qui définissent le style par rapport à ceux-ci constituent un système—permanent, lui—de possibilités, que l'ancienne rhétorique décrivait déjà, et dont chaque écrivain offre un cas singulier mais réductible à l'ensemble. Le nier revient à dire qu'une équation algébrique n'a pas d'existence générale en dehors des applications particulières et pratiques pour lesquelles un ingénieur choisit de l'employer. Si, pour reprendre les exemples de l'ouvrage, la valeur poétique des sons varie avec le temps, c'est que les sons varient eux-mêmes; pourtant on ne refuse pas existence à la phonétique historique; si l'emploi littéraire d'un dialecte n'a pas même valeur pour un Italien et un Français, c'est que dans leurs systèmes différents les pôles norme et dialecte n'ayant pas même valeur, leur opposition n'a pas le même effet, mais il y aura toujours un rapport d'opposition du dialecte à la norme, quelle que soit son orientation, et voilà qui est constant et général. C'est là le fait de style, choix dicté par une intention artistique ou expres-

sive; choix qui n'est ni indéfini ni infini; à côté des oppositions signifiantes de la langue, système, dirais-je, d'oppositions "significatives".

Ces objections n'empêchent pas le *Supplément* d'être extrêmement pratique, de forcer à penser, ce qui est le but idéal de tout instrument de recherche. Attendons une *Suite*, avec impatience. (MICHAEL RIFFATERRE, *Columbia University*)

The Phonology of Italian, Spanish, and French by Harry A. Deferrari. Ann Arbor: Edward Brothers Inc., 1954. Pp. xv + 611. To beginners in the field of Romance linguistics, especially those without training in phonetics, phonology has always seemed the most esoteric and formidable branch of that discipline; hence, a book written expressly for the uninitiated and having as its "sole purpose . . . to make the phonology of Italian, Spanish, and French as simple and understandable as it can possibly be made" is to be welcomed. The present book contains a wealth of basic descriptive and explanatory material, most of it so presented that it cannot fail to make the main subject comprehensible to beginners. It begins with a glossary of 139 terms, several of them discussed at some length. Here the author attempts to refit the clumsy old terms "phonetic laws," or "phonetic rules," and "phonetic tendencies" for service once more, but clarity and scientific objectivity are better served if phonologists operate without them and use "change," "shift," or "trend" instead, as the occasion or point of view may demand. There are several pages devoted to admirably clear diagrams and descriptions of the organs of speech, followed by a section on general phonetics. Another important feature not found in handbooks on general Romance linguistics are the sections on the contemporary standard pronunciations of the three languages treated. The inclusion of all this material should be a boon to beginners and their teachers, especially where it is not available in specialized works or where years of spoon-feeding renders students unable or unwilling to seek it for themselves. The section entitled "Romance Generalities," which presents a number of changes common to the three languages—it begins with a few observations of questionable validity in the opinion of this reviewer—will be largely incomprehensible to beginners unless it is read after the section on general phonetics, not before, where it now appears. The section on the sounds of Classical and Vulgar Latin is short, but adequate for the purposes of this book. Finally there are the three long sections on the diachronic phonologies of standard Italian, Spanish, and French.

Although the subject matter seems to have been made as understandable, on the whole, as the traditional manner of presentation would allow, it would probably have been made even more so if a structural presentation had been used, whereby the sounds of a language are seen at any given point in its evolution as forming a highly integrated pattern on the paradigmatic plane. Essential to such an approach to phonology is the phonemic theory, which the author was disposed to reject. In his "Preface" he makes a statement that is bound to shock, and perhaps to antagonize, many linguists. Explaining that language is a continuum, i.e. that phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, etc., interact and are artificial divisions, in the first place, he continues: "Furthermore, we cannot refrain, even at this 'early' date, from predicting that an honest (scientific) consideration of language as a continuum will result in the complete bankruptcy of the 'phoneme,' 'sememe,' 'taxeme,' etc. It is our belief that the theory of the 'phoneme' (and the extension of that theory) has done much to retard progress in linguistics."

However, the work shows little effect of this opinion, for most of the data are avowedly presented in the traditional manner, which is, whether the traditionalists are conscious of it or not, largely phonemic, though not structural. But in the sections on the contemporary standard pronunciations we find contextual variants of some of the phonemes deliberately treated as though they were separate "sounds."

A noteworthy feature of the book is the author's attempt at a theory of linguistic change, which he sums up as follows: "... the basic cause of all linguistic change is the interplay of the two urges (almost wholly unconscious), the one for effectiveness (clarity) and the other for conservation of energy." This differs in one essential respect from the functional-structural theory of phonological change enunciated by André Martinet in his "Function, Structure, and Sound Change" (WORD, VIII, 1-32; an expansion of this article, with the title *Economie des changements phonétiques*, will soon be published by A. Francke, Bern). According to the latter theory, there is a third fundamental factor, the functional asymmetry of the speech organs, which will always prevent the attainment of stable phonological patterns even where external factors are not at work. Deferrari's working out of his theory of the conflict between expressivity and economy is somewhat baffling and disappointing. He attempts to show every detail, real or imaginary, of every change that he undertakes to explain as either "assimilation" or "disassimilation"; but it is probably his theoretical rejection of the phonemic concept that has prevented the author from applying his basic theoretical idea more fruitfully and extensively than he has. His explanation of diphthongization as a "reaction against oversimplification," i.e. against a "threatened assimilation" among vowels (long ago explained by the proponents of the functional-structural theory as a means whereby the phonemic oppositions of the vocalic system, or pattern, are maintained), is the author's only direct application of his theory to paradigmatic phonemic structure, though he was apparently not fully aware of the existence of such structure.

A substitution of Daniel Jones's vowel ellipse for the traditional vowel triangle is urged on the grounds that the former more accurately represents the points of articulation of the vowels. But structuralists prefer to use the triangle, or in some cases the quadrangle, because it is intended to represent not only the relative positions of the vowels but also their oppositional relationships as phonemes; moreover, histories of vowel systems offer much evidence that there must be a greater distance between the front and back close vowels than between the front and back open vowels. Whether this distance is only acoustic (lip-rounding and the consequent lengthening of the buccal cavity is more practicable and effective with the close vowels than with the open ones) or whether it applies also to the position of the tongue, it should in either case be represented diagrammatically.

Even though one may take exception to some of the theoretical points of the book, one must admire the perspicacity that permitted Deferrari to see, apparently independently, the importance of function and economy in the problem of phonological change. He died in 1950 at the age of fifty-five; the book was published by his brothers and sisters. (FREDRICK JUNGEMANN, *New York University*)

Victor-Emile Michelet, *poète ésotérique*. Par Richard E. Knowles; préface par Gaston Bachelard. Paris: Vrin, 1954. Pp. xii + 308. Important literary prizes and eloquent tributes of contemporaries from Barrès and Mallarmé to Apollinaire were

bestowed on Michelet. Today he is forgotten and we must be thankful for this thesis (for the Doctorat de l'Université de Paris) which brings him back to light, kindly and without making undue claims for his greatness. Victor-Emile Michelet was born in Nantes in 1861 and lived an uneventful life in Paris until his death in 1938. He is unrelated to the historian whose fame may have made him an unwanted rival and whom the poet rejects in the critical tradition of Barbey d'Aureville as a "sénile banderillero qu'éventra . . . un coup de corne de cet âpre taureau de la logique, Proudhon" (p. 5).

After publishing *De l'ésotérisme dans l'art*, short stories on love and death, and contributing to reviews, Michelet collected his poetry in *La Porte d'or* and provoked for once a storm of publicity: he was awarded the first Prix Sully Prudhomme (1902), intended for less experienced authors and young men of less than 41. In later years, his poetry (rather than his prose or drama) gained further recognition; he died as a member of the Maison de Poésie, whose substantial Grand Prix he had received, of the Académie des poètes, and as Grand Maître du Suprême Conseil Martiniste. Michelet was influenced by Cazotte and the esoteric Saint-Martin, Stanislas de Guaita, Papus, and Eliphas Lévy. Knowles also traces the importance of Vigny, Baudelaire, Barbey, and Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, a close friend from 1885 until his death in 1889, all glorified in Michelet's *Figures d'évocateurs*.

It was time to gather the scattered documents concerning Michelet since the *Amis de Victor-Emile Michelet* and his widow could give only vague indications. Knowles could compose no more than an "essai de biographie" without accurate data on the youth and on the frustrations so clearly reflected in Michelet's work. Perhaps it was already too late to establish the record of Michelet's experiences, hopes, and fears. To this sketch Knowles adds an ambitious introduction to Martinism and theosophy and to Michelet's esoteric themes. There follow a detailed analysis of his works, with ample quotations illustrating both strength and weaknesses, particularly useful since so little of Michelet is now available, and a generous bibliography. Had Knowles traced Michelet's mystical themes further to his numerous precursors who include Hugo, Gautier, and Balzac (cf. the works of A. Viatte and P. Moreau, "Romantisme et synchrétisme," *Symposium* 8: 1-17, 1954), he might have been less inclined to assign him to a wave of esoteric idealism which rose in 1885 and vanished in 1898 (pp. 38, 59). Knowles did however illustrate the tradition of Cazotte and Boehme, and his study becomes an indispensable introduction to the esoteric poetry of Michelet's time.

There are some short-comings. More could have been said about Michelet's interesting deviations from form, rhythm, and sound; about the expanded sonnet of 15 lines in the manner of Albert Samain and about Alexandrines without *hémistiche* in patterns of 4, 5, and 3 syllable groups. We also wish that the author had taken a more critical attitude toward the interpretation of dreams and the subconscious as practiced by Bachelard, who wrote the preface, and Annia Telliard, whose weird "Analyse d'écriture" appears in an appendix and rationalizes "les barres de t lancées" into "violence et esprit de domination" (pp. 283-85, cf. 263-65). This method is a poor substitute for facts which Michelet's widow seems to have been unwilling to divulge. Above all, however, we miss original interpretation and critical judgment. Rather than venturing a single opinion on individual works, Knowles quotes reviewers, and even the appreciation of Michelet's best works, *Le Tombeau d'Hélène* and *L'Espoir merveilleux*, is documented as second hand.

We still need an explanation of the haunting theme of death which drove Michelet

to seek symbols which, more than the depreciated concepts of orthodoxy, could help in the heroic and Cornelian search for "la victoire où nous devons prétendre," "un héroïque amour, plus fort que le tombeau," the new Jerusalem.¹ The *Contes aventureux*, for instance, show love inevitably followed by death in *La Fiancée trépassée*, *Holwennioul*, and *La Condamnation amoureuse*, and death is the central motif throughout these tales of Breton lore which show not only the mystical "atavisme breton" (p. 42) but are significant as variations on Cazotte's *Diable amoureux*, Gautier's *Albertus*, and the romantic association of love and death. The motto of *Holwennioul* is: "Si ton idéal est mortel, tu mourras de l'atteindre." Even in the poems of hope of *L'Espoir merveilleux* death is the key motif.² When Michelet wishes that the muses might revive in the poet the lost spark "pour lui donner la force extatique de croire,"³ we can see that he is dominated by the horror of having lost his faith; the power to believe is the "espoir merveilleux," the means of rising beyond death and human limitations. His tormented poetry is worthy of note since his search for modes of expression and new symbols lends his seemingly cold and abstract style a touch of passionate and esoteric idealism. (OSCAR A. HAAO, *Emory University*)

Portrait of a Symbolist Hero: An Existential Study Based on the Work of Alain-Fournier. By Robert Champigny. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1954. Pp. 164. Mr. Champigny intends to show that *Le Grand Meaulnes* is the poetic record of Alain-Fournier's growth, the testimony of a spiritual progress from his original choice of an aesthetic approach to life toward a state of Sartrean "good faith." The demonstration of his thesis is based upon several major premises. The most important of these is the existential theory of an early, basic choice of attitude toward experience. As Sartre states in *L'Être et le néant*, and later illustrates in his study of *Baudelaire*, this choice will form the pattern for man's reaction toward other experiences in the course of his life. The second premise is the Kierkegaardian distinction between the ethical man, or man in his relation to others, and the aesthetic man. The latter accepts experience not to be controlled and formed into human relationships, but as material to be molded into art. The third premise is a tacit agreement that the Romantic hero and the Symbolist hero are essentially aesthetic beings whose lives are expressed indirectly in poetic creations.

If one accepts these premises (and many will not) this book becomes a philosophical and psychological study of Alain-Fournier between 1905 and 1912 through a logical analysis of his life and his works. Fournier, through his meeting with the real, inaccessible Yvonne, in Paris, makes the choice of becoming an aesthetic man: that is, instead of trying to mold the event to his will, he will recreate its poetry through memory. At the same time, he is in a state of "bad faith" because he is torn between his choice and his wanting to be an ethical man. Therefore, he explores himself through the creation of his three characters: Seurel, Frantz, and Meaulnes. Seurel represents the ethical Fournier who wanted to marry Yvonne; Meaulnes represents Fournier's choice of becoming an aesthetic man who declines real life for poetic life. Between lies Frantz who seems to be the Romantic hero, who seeks poetry in the adventure, rather than in his own perception of the adventure and who finally returns to the very human situation of a marriage with Valentine.

1. V.-E. Michelet: *L'Espoir merveilleux*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Mercure de France, 1908), pp. 187, 222, 223.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 190, 198, 200.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

Meaulnes, in trying to find once again the marvelous "*pays*," demonstrates Alain-Fournier's attempt to recover the state of poetic grace that his meeting with Yvonne seems to have created. However, as Meaulnes fails to recover the poetry when he returns to the domain, so Fournier learned that the vision lay not in the meeting with the real Yvonne but in himself. Any attempt to renew the moment of wonder in reality could end only in failure. It had to be translated into an aesthetic concept, recreated poetically, in order to exist again. Both in the book and in real life, Yvonne falls from her position as a muse into that of a purely human woman who has married and had a child. She becomes a flaw in the perfection that she had awakened in the memory of the poet. Only after the real Yvonne has been met again and the fictitious Yvonne has died, can the memory of the moment of wonder return to its perfection. As Mr. Champigny remarks, Alain-Fournier did not really want to marry the real Yvonne any more than Meaulnes wanted to return to the lost domain. Yet, because Yvonne the real had descended from muse to woman, Fournier took revenge upon her through his cruel love affair with Jeanne B. The latter was his victim, made to suffer because of Fournier's "bad faith."

In creating Meaulnes, Fournier was completely involved. He defined himself through his three characters and placed them in a subjective world that was a limitless symbolist landscape. He tried to create faithfully both the moment of experience and the mystery of the experience as well as the nostalgia for the poetic vision. His book was, then, a repetition of his meeting with Yvonne and its aesthetic significance. By writing *Le Grand Meaulnes*, Fournier relived his growth from the ethical Seurel that he was when he met Yvonne to the hero Meaulnes, who had rejected an ethical approach to his love for a purely aesthetic one.

This rather sinewy approach to *Le Grand Meaulnes* is a relief from the usual semi-sweet sentimentality that pervades too many studies of the novel. It is a provocative analysis of a Symbolist hero. Yet one must ask the same questions that one has already asked of Sartre's *Baudelaires*. Does this analysis throw any real light upon the work of art? Rather, does it not slyly lead the reader through a bypass away from the artistic creation into a theoretical study of the author? Does it clarify the personality of the author? To a modern reader accustomed to penetrating psychological analysis, this type of psychological criticism stemming from existential psychoanalysis (which has not yet been thoroughly enunciated) gives the impression of a brilliant light focused upon a single side of a creative personality. The rest lies in even deeper shadow because of the sharp light. Too much is missing in the attempt to reconstruct or to codify the human being. Is there, after all, a basic choice? Were there not other choices, perhaps, or further dark questions as to why the basic choice was made if there was one?

The English of the book is excellent, although there is a certain rigid conciseness to Mr. Champigny's style, and an over-use of terms that makes the work seem too logical, too serious, and too dogmatic. The flow of ideas, which are easy and well ordered though too theoretical, would stand out better if the style were more subtle and flexible. (BLANCHE ADELLE PRICE, *Miss Porter's School*)

Bibliographie de la littérature française 1940-1949. Par Marguerite L. Drevet. (Complément à la Bibliographie de H. P. Thieme.) Genève: Droz; Lille: Giard, 1954. Pp. xvi + 644. Le Thieme a rendu et continue à rendre service, en dépit des multiples erreurs qui le déparent et dont certaines sont devenues proverbiales,

comme la confusion entre Colette et Colette Yver. On n'a rien à craindre de pareil avec les deux volumes qui lui font suite, le Dreher et Rolli pour la période 1930-1939 et le Drevet qui vient de paraître (achevé d'imprimer en mai 1955); ils sont incomparablement plus corrects. La perfection en ce domaine a contre elle bien des obstacles et elle a pour rançon d'interminables délais. Il convient de féliciter Mlle Drevet et ses éditeurs d'avoir réussi à faire paraître leur nouveau répertoire cinq ans après la décade qu'il couvre.

On y relèvera nécessairement des fautes. Noms estropiés: Brasilach pour Brasilach, Fernandiat pour Fernandat, Freme pour Frame. Prénoms changés: René pour Jean, Gabriel pour Gabrielle. Accent superflu: sur le premier *e* de Vielé-Griffin, mais il est devenu si courant qu'on n'ose plus protester. Titres partiellement incorrects: *Si le grain se meurt*, *Vies* (au lieu de *Vues*), *Messages poétiques du symbolisme* et *Les Premiers Articles de Paul Valéry* (il faut restituer le singulier). Erreurs de dates: suivant fidèlement Dreher et Rolli, on fait mourir Ernest-Charles en 1925, alors qu'il a vécu jusqu'en 1953; Edouard Bourdet n'est pas mort en 1937 mais en 1945; Salacrou n'est pas né en 1895 mais en 1899. Quelques dates omises auraient pu être aisément obtenues en consultant certains ouvrages et les nécrologies des périodiques. Il n'est pas toujours facile dans la liste chronologique des œuvres d'un auteur de distinguer une édition nouvelle de l'originale.

On pourrait faire d'autres réserves, mais, pour être juste, il faut bien avouer qu'elles dépassent les exigences légitimes. Comment demander au bibliographe, dans un champ aussi vaste, une compétence universelle, une érudition sans défaut, un sens critique à toute épreuve? Le choix des articles consacrés à un auteur a été obtenu en dépouillant un grand nombre de périodiques, dont la liste occupe six colonnes, et Mlle Drevet a eu la bonne idée d'y ajouter des *Mélanges*; il en résulte qu'on retient des textes insignifiants et qu'on ignore une étude importante parue ailleurs, que le recours aux meilleurs ouvrages sur cet écrivain aurait peut-être permis de repérer. On est parfois étonné de la rareté des articles sur certains auteurs (historiens et philosophes, en particulier). Grâce au dépôt légal, les références aux volumes ont chance d'être plus complètes; risque cependant d'échapper l'ouvrage dont le titre n'indique pas clairement qu'il traitera de l'écrivain dont on établit la bibliographie. Je dois dire que, sur ce point, Mlle Drevet a été attentive. Par exemple, le livre de Charles Lalo sur *L'Economie des passions* (1947) comporte des chapitres sur Balzac, Hugo, Mme Ackermann, etc. . . ; on le trouvera cité à chacun de ces noms.

La réserve la plus sérieuse viserait, on s'en doute, le choix des auteurs jugés dignes d'une rubrique. A part les noms célèbres qui s'imposent, il faut bien reconnaître que le partage entre les élus et les réprouvés est assez flottant. Les romanciers et les poètes reçoivent la part du lion, ce qui serait naturel s'il ne s'agissait que de lions. On ne discutera pas certaines présences et certaines absences contestables. Mais, puisqu'il s'agit de littérature au sens large, et qu'on fait figurer au répertoire, très justement, un éminent géographe comme Emmanuel de Martonne ou un grand chirurgien comme Leriche, on s'étonne, après avoir parcouru les rubriques réservées à des écrivains, disons mineurs, comme Florian-Parmentier, Maffeo Charles Poinot ou Yves de Constantin, qu'aucun article ne soit consacré à Lucien Febvre, Emile Bréhier, René Le Senne, Etienne Souriau, Charles Bruneau . . . (qui n'avaient pas eu non plus cet honneur dans le Dreher et Rolli). On nous répondra qu'on ne peut pas "mettre tout le monde," mais je constate, sans citer de noms, qu'on n'a pas

oublié des historiens, des linguistes, des philosophes, des essayistes qui n'ont pas toujours la renommée ni l'importance de ceux qu'on a exclus. Les historiens littéraires sont mieux traités, en général, mais non sans quelque caprice déconcertant.

En dehors de son rôle d'instrument de recherche, la bibliographie de Mlle Drevet est, comme tout catalogue, très intéressante à parcourir. Elle fait revivre, à sa manière, une des époques les plus troublées de notre histoire. Elle souligne l'apparition ou le succès de nouveaux courants. Des noms nouveaux surgissent ou prennent toute leur importance. Chacun peut rêver là-dessus à son gré. Je remarquerai seulement l'abondance bibliographique qui met matériellement en relief certains noms d'écrivains. Valéry vient en tête, avec près de 15 colonnes. Parmi les auteurs de sa génération, Gide en occupe 12, Claudel 10, Proust 9½, Péguy 8, Romain Rolland 5. Parmi leurs cadets, le triomphateur est Sartre, avec plus de 12 colonnes. Camus, plus jeune, n'en est encore qu'à 4½. Veut-on d'autres chiffres? Mauriac 7¼, Jacob, Giraudoux et Aragon 6, Eluard 5½, Montherlant 5, Romains 4½, Saint-Exupéry 4¼, Malraux 4. Les anciens tiennent bon: Mallarmé 8½, Rimbaud 8, Baudelaire 8, mais France 5 et Verlaine 4, Lautréamont 2. Quant aux ancêtres, c'est Stendhal qui l'emporte: 13 colonnes, suivi de près par Balzac: 12. Et Hugo? 9½. Chateaubriand: 8, Lamartine 4, Nerval 3, Gautier 1¼. Il serait intéressant de réintroduire un peu de qualité dans cette quantité, en distinguant parmi les témoignages, d'inégale valeur, qui s'attachent à ces noms célèbres. Qui sait si les proportions que nous venons d'enregistrer n'en seraient pas parfois changées sensiblement? (J. H.)

Bernanos par lui-même. Images et textes présentés par Albert Béguin. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1954. Pp. 191. This book consists of an 88-page essay on Bernanos' character plus a selection of personal documents arranged to illumine the major events of the novelist's career. Most of the material has hitherto been buried in reviews; the amount of actual *inédit* is small. Many of the photographs, which are excellent, were recovered from the ruins of the bombed-out family seat at Fressins in 1949, after Bernanos' death. Also included are a number of pen and ink sketches from the margins of Bernanos' letters and the manuscript of *Un Crime*. Used in conjunction with the *cahiers* of the Société des Amis de Georges Bernanos and the collection of *ana* published in the "Cahiers du Rhône" (series 1949), the present volume—the newest in the "Ecrivains de Toujours" collection—is an immensely useful instrument.

It has one defect. M. Béguin was a prime mover in the formation of the Société des amis . . . , a group which has always striven to preserve the memory of an unusual personality even more than of a great polemicist and novelist. He dedicates *Bernanos par lui-même* to the same purpose. The figure which emerges from the book is perhaps a little too well prepared for its niche; the pages exude a slight atmosphere of hagiography.

More or less obscured is a side of Bernanos which would tell us much about the novels if we knew it better. He was as much a creature of obsessions as are Malraux and Céline, and his obsessions were transmuted into the themes of his writing. His anxiety states were pathological and had to be treated. He was subject to fits of anger during which he was apparently quite out of control. At times he sounds like a Dostoevski afflicted by ills other than epilepsy. One suspects that a more probing examination of this aspect of the novelist would reveal much about *Monsieur Ouine* and *Sous le soleil de satan*, if not about *Journal d'un curé de campagne*.

M. Béguin is not unaware of this, but prefers to insist upon the polarity of feelings

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XLVI

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, PUBLISHER

NEW YORK 1955

VOLUME XLVI: AUTHOR INDEX

- Arndt, Richard T., *The Embattled Philosopher: A Biography of Denis Diderot* by L. G. Crocker, 149-51
- Balakian, Anna, *Studies in French Symbolism (1945-1955)*, 223-30
- Bart, B. F., *Flaubert's Correspondence*, 25-34
- Bédé, Jean-Albert, *Histoire d'un éditeur et de ses auteurs: P. J. Hetzel (Stahl)* by A. Parménie and C. Bonnier de la Chapelle, 52-55
- , *Provençal Regionalism: A Study of the Movement in the Revue Félibréenne, Le Feu, and Other Reviews of Southern France* by A. V. Roche, 135-38
- , *The Culture of France in Our Time* by J. Park, 157-58
- Bergin, Thomas G., *Les Troubadours* by E. Hoepffner, 288
- Breunig, LeRoy C., *Apollinaire Since 1950*, 35-40
- , *Editorial Comment*, 218-22
- Casey, Brother Camillus, *Gerbert de Mez: Chanson de geste du XII^e siècle* edited by P. Taylor, 145-46
- Cherpack, Clifton, *Voltaire's Criticism of Petrarch*, 101-7
- Cohn, Robert Greer, *Vers une explication rationnelle du Coup de Dés: Essai d'exégèse mallarméenne* by G. Davies, 141-43
- Conner, Wayne, *The Loge in Aucassin et Nicolette*, 81-89
- Crisafulli, Alessandro S., *Montesquieu: Lettres persanes* edited by A. Adam, 294-96
- Crowley, Francis J., *Notes on Voltaire's Zulime*, 108-11
- Demorest, J.-J., *La Doctrine de Port-Royal: La Morale* by J. Laporte, 59-60
- Fess, Malcolm Gilbert, *Maupassant the Novelist* by E. D. Sullivan, 154-55
- Frank, Grace, *Les Miracles de Notre Dame par Gautier de Coinci* edited by V. F. Koenig, 286
- Frohock, W. M., *Rimbaud's Poetics: Hallucination and Epiphany*, 192-202
- , *Bernanos par lui-même* presented by A. Béguin, 312-13
- George, Albert J., *George Sand* by P. Salomon, 64-65
- Gilman, Margaret, *Baudelaire, l'homme et l'œuvre* by M. A. Ruff, 280-85
- , *L'Espirito del mal et l'esthétique baudelairienne* by M. A. Ruff, 280-85
- Gilman, Stephen, *The Structure of Spanish History* by A. Castro, 61-63
- Graham, Victor E., *Méditations avec un Essai de poèmes chrétiens* by Jean de Sponde. Introduction by A. Boase, 58-59
- Grant, Elliott M., *Victor Hugo: Journal 1830-1848* edited by H. Guillemin, 302-3
- Haac, Oscar A., *Victor-Emile Michelet, poète ésotérique* by R. E. Knowles, 307-9
- Havens, George R., *Montesquieu, 1689-1755* (review), 293-94
- Highet, Gilbert, *Ronsard and the Conventional Roman Elegy* by R. E. Halliwell, 56-57
- Hubert, Judd D., *Baudelaire's Revolutionary Poetics*, 164-77
- Hunt, H. J., *The Pessimism of Leconte de Lisle: Sources and Evolution* by I. Putter, 236-37
- Hytier, Jean, *Niccolò Secchi: Self-Interest* translated by W. Reymes. Edited by H. A. Kaufman, 61
- , *The Parisian Stage: Alphabetical Indexes of Plays and Authors. Part I: 1800-1815; part II: 1815-1830* by C. B. Wicks, 138-40
- , *Bibliographie de la littérature française 1940-1944* by M. L. Drevet, 310-12
- Jasinski, René, *L'Hellénisme des Romantiques; Tome II: Le Romantisme des Grecs, 1826-1840* by René Canat, 131-34
- Jungemann, Frederick, *The Phonology of Italian, Spanish, and French* by H. A. Deferrari, 306-7
- Kolb, Philip, *Avec Marcel Proust, suivi de dix-sept lettres inédites de Proust* by E. Jaloux, 67-69
- Kurth, Arthur L., *Malherbe: Technique et création poétique* by R. Fromilhague, 125-28
- , *La Vie de Malherbe: Apprentissages et luttes, 1555-1610* by R. Fromilhague, 125-28
- Labat, Alvin, *Colette: A Provincial in Paris* by M. Crosland, 70-71
- Lane, Frederic C., *Machiavelli Anti-Cristo* by G. Prezzolini, 290-91
- LeSage, Laurent, *Le Théâtre de Giraudoux* by M. Mercier-Campiche, 76-77
- Levin, Harry, *The Poetics of French Symbolism*, 161-63

- Loy, J. Robert, *Diderot's Unedited Plan d'un opéra comique*, 3-24
- MacAllister, A. T., *A History of Italian Literature* by E. E. Wilkins, 44-48
- Marie Louise, Sister (O. P.), *Dans Pascal* by J. Demorest, 275-80
- , *Pascal par lui-même* by A. Béguin, 275-80
- Marshall, Robert G., *Marivaux e il suo teatro* by O. Ruggiero, 148-49
- Mathews, Jackson, *The Poetics of Paul Valéry*, 203-17
- May, Georges, *Jean Giraudoux, Surrealism, and the German Romantic Ideal* by L. LeSage, 156-57
- McKee, Kenneth N., *Marivaux par lui-même* by P. Gazagne, 296-97
- Meyer, Paul H., *New Letters of David Hume* edited by R. Klibansky and E. C. Mossner, 297-99
- , *The Life of David Hume* by E. C. Mossner, 298-99
- Naughton, A. E. A., *Claudel and Mallarmé*, 258-74
- Nitze, William A., *The Medieval French Drama* by G. Frank, 41-44
- Palfrey, Thomas R., *Une Irlandaise libérale en France sous la Restauration: Lady Morgan, 1775-1859* by M. I. Moraud, 301-2
- Peckham, Lawton P. G., *Langue et Culture de la France* by C. Vossler, 76
- , *Chrestomathie de la littérature en ancien français* by A. Henry, 144-45
- Peyre, Henri, *Le Romantisme contemporain: Essai sur l'inquiétude et l'évasion dans les lettres françaises de 1850 à 1950* by M. Paribatra, 155-56
- , *Journal littéraire, 1893-1906* by P. Léautaud, 237-38
- Pleasants, Jeanne Varney, *Cahiers de la Compagnie Madeleine Renaud-Jean-Louis Barrault*, 74-76
- Politzer, Robert L., *Rousseau on the Theatre and the Actors*, 250-57
- Predmore, R. L., *Temas de Unamuno* by C. Clavería, 303-4
- Price, Blanche Adelle, *Portrait of a Symbolist Hero: An Existential Study Based on the Work of Alain-Fournier* by R. Champigny, 309-10
- Ragusa, Olga, *French Symbolism in Italy*, 231-35
- Ramsey, Warren, *A View of Mallarmé's Poetics*, 178-91
- Rey, Agapito, Alfonso Martínez de Toledo: *Arcipreste de Talavera* edited by M. Penna, 288-90
- Riffaterre, Michael, *A Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics Applied to the Romance Literatures, 1900-1952* by H. A. Hatzfeld, 49-52
- , *Etudes sur la traduction française de la "Morale à Nicomache" by J. P. H. Knops*, 146-48
- , *Supplément bibliographique à l'introduction à la linguistique française 1947-1953* by R.-L. Wagner, 304-6
- Rothberg, Irving P., *Biblioteca de traductores españoles* by M. M. Pelayo, 128-31
- Roudiez, Léon S., *L'Allemagne vue par les écrivains de la résistance française* by K. F. Bieber, 73-74
- Schaffer, Aaron, *Leconte de Lisle: L'Homme et l'œuvre* by P. Flottes, 152-54
- Selig, Karl Ludwig, *Opere* by Italo Svevo, 71-72
- Shoemaker, W. H., *Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process* by W. T. Pattison, 65-67
- Silver, Isidore, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Clément Marot* by C. A. Mayer, 291-92
- , *Ronsard poète de l'amour. Livre II: De Marie à Genevieve* by F. Desonay, 292-93
- Starr, William T., *Cette âme ardente... Choix de lettres de André Suarès à Romain Rolland, 1887-1891*, 69-70
- Torres-Rioseco, A., *Proceso y contenido de la novela hispano-americana* by L. A. Sánchez, 151-52
- Torrey, Norman L., *Voltaire's Correspondence. Vols. IV-VI. Edited by T. Besterman*, 63-64
- , *From Reaction to Revolution in Eighteenth-Century France* by G. R. Havens, 299-301
- Vial, Fernand, *Mémoires improvisés* by Paul Claudel, 72-73
- Wadsworth, James B., *Lorenzo de' Medici and Marsilio Ficino: An Experiment in Platonic Friendship*, 90-100
- Wadsworth, Philip A., *La Fontaine and La Rochefoucauld*, 241-49
- Wagner, Geoffrey, *Wyndham Lewis and Bergson*, 112-24
- Williams, Harry F., *The Oldest Version of the Twelfth-Century Poem La Venjance Nostre Seigneur* edited by L. A. T. Gryting, 286-88
- Williamson, Edward, *Ludovico Ariosto: Orlando furioso* translated by A. Gilbert, 57-58

VOLUME XLVI: SUBJECT INDEX

- Adam, Antoine, editor, Montesquieu: *Lettres persanes* (review), 294-96
- Alain-Fournier, 309-10
- Amrouche, Jean, 72-73
- Apollinaire, 35-40
- Arcipreste de Talavera, 288-90
- Ariosto, 57-58
- Arnauld, Antoine, 59-60
- Aucassin et Nicolette, 81-89
- Barrault, Jean-Louis, 74-76
- Baudelaire, 161-77, 218-35, 280-85
- Béguin, Albert, *Pascal par lui-même* (review), 275-80
- , *Bernanos par lui-même* (review), 312-13
- Bergson, 112-24
- Bernanos, 312-13
- Besterman, Theodore, editor, *Voltaire's Correspondence* (review), 63-64
- Bibliography, 291-92, 310-12
- Biblioteca de traductores españoles (Menéndez Pelayo), 128-31
- Bieber, Konrad F., *L'Allemagne vue par les écrivains de la résistance française* (review), 73-74
- Boase, Alan, see Sponde, Jean de
- Bonnier de la Chapelle, A., see Parménie, A.
- Canat, René, *L'Hellénisme des Romantiques; Tome II: Le Romantisme des Grecs, 1826-1840* (review), 131-34
- Castro, Americo, *The Structure of Spanish History* (review), 61-63
- Champigny, Robert, *Portrait of a Symbolist Hero: An Existential Study Based on the Work of Alain-Fournier* (review), 309-10
- Chrestomathy (Old French), 144-45
- Christophe Colomb (Claudel), 74-76
- Claudel, 72-76, 258-74
- Clavería, Carlos, *Temas de Unamuno* (review) 303-4
- Colette, 70-71
- Correspondence, 25-34, 52-55, 63-64, 67-70, 90-100, 297-98
- Crocker, Lester G., *The Embattled Philosopher: A Biography of Denis Diderot* (review), 149-51
- Crosland, Margaret, *Colette: A Provincial in Paris* (review), 70-71
- Davies, Gardner, *Vers une explication rationnelle du Coup de Dés: Essai d'exégèse mallarméenne* (review), 141-43
- Deferrari, Harry A., *The Phonology of Italian, Spanish, and French* (review), 306-7
- Demorest, Jean, *Danc Pascal* (review), 275-80
- Desonay, Fernand, *Ronsard poète de l'amour. Livre II: De Marie à Genève* (review), 292-93
- Diderot, 3-24, 149-51
- Drevet, Marguerite L., *Bibliographie de la littérature française 1940-49* (review), 310-12
- Essai de poèmes chrétiens* (Jean de Sponde), 58-59
- Feu, Le* (Revue Félibréenne), 135-38
- Ficino, Marsilio, 90-100
- Flaubert, 25-34
- Flottes, Pierre, *Leconte de Lisle: L'Homme et l'œuvre* (review), 152-54
- Frank, Grace, *The Medieval French Drama* (review), 41-44
- Fromilhague, René, *La Vie de Malherbe: Apprentissages et luites, 1555-1610* (review), 125-28
- , *Malherbe: Technique et création poétique* (review), 125-28
- Galdós, Benito Pérez, 65-67
- Gautier de Coinci, 286
- Gazagne, Paul, *Marivaux par lui-même* (review), 296-97
- Gerbert de Metz, 145-46
- Gilbert, Allan, translator, *Ludovico Ariosto: Orlando furioso* (review), 57-58
- Giraudoux, 76-77, 156-57
- Gryting, Loyal A. T., editor, *The Oldest Version of the Twelfth-Century Poem La Venjance Nostre Seigneur* (review), 286-88
- Guillemin, H., editor, *Victor Hugo: Journal 1830-1848* (review), 302-3
- Hallowell, Robert E., *Ronsard and the Conventional Roman Elegy* (review), 56-57
- Hatzfeld, Helmut A., *A Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics Applied to the Romance Literatures, 1900-1952* (review), 49-52

- Havens, George R., *From Reaction to Revolution in Eighteenth-Century France* (review), 299-301
- Henry, Albert, *Chrestomathie de la littérature en ancien français* (review), 144-45
- Hetzel, P.-J., (Stahl), 52-55
- History (French), 299-302
- History (Spanish), 61-63
- Hoepffner, Ernest, *Les Troubadours* (review), 288
- Hugo, Victor, 302-3
- Hume, 297-99
- Italian Literature, 44-48
- Jaloux, Edmond, *Avec Marcel Proust, suivi de dix-sept lettres inédites de Proust* (review), 67-69
- Jansenism, 59-60
- Journal* (Hugo), 302-3
- Jailland, Alphonse, *see* Voëssler, Ch.
- Kaufman, Helen Andrews, editor, *Niccolo Secchi: Self-Interest* (review), 61
- King, Edmund, L., 61-63
- Klibansky, Raymond and E. C. Mossner, editors, *New Letters of David Hume* (review), 297-98
- Knops, Jan Pieter Hubert, *Etudes sur la traduction française de la "Morale à Nicomache" d'Aristote par Nicole Oresme* (review), 146-48
- Knowles, Richard E., *Victor-Emile Michelet, poète ésotérique* (review), 307-9
- Koenig, V. Frederic, editor, *Les Miracles de Notre Dame par Gautier de Coinci* (review), 286
- La Fontaine, 241-49
- Laporte, Jean, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal: La Morale* (review), 59-60
- La Rochefoucauld, 241-49
- Léautaud, Paul, *Journal littéraire, 1893-1906* (review), 237-38
- Leconte de Lisle, 152-54, 236-37
- LeSage, Laurence, *Jean Giraudoux, Surrealism, and the German Romantic Ideal* (review), 156-57
- Lettres persanes*, 294-96
- Lewis, Wyndham, 112-24
- Linguistics, 304-6
- Literary criticism, 146-48
- Literary Criticism (French), 35-40, 223-30
- Literary Criticism (Italian), 231-35
- Literary History (French), 52-55, 73-74, 131-34, 155-58, 236-38
- Literary History (Italian), 44-48
- Literary History (Provençal), 135-38, 288
- Literary History (Spanish), 128-31
- Literary History (Spanish American), 151-52
- Machiavelli, 290-91
- Maier, Bruno, *see* Svevo, Italo
- Malherbe, 125-28
- Mallarmé, 141-43, 161-63, 178-91, 218-35, 258-74
- Marivaux, 148-49, 296-97
- Marot, Clément, 291-92
- Martínez de Toledo, Alfonso, 288-90
- Maupassant, 154-55
- Mayer, C. A., *Bibliographie des œuvres de Clément Marot* (review), 291-92
- Medici, Lorenzo de', 90-100
- Méditations* (Jean de Sponde), 58-59
- Mercier-Campiche, Marianne, *Le Théâtre de Giraudoux* (review), 76-77
- Michelet, Victor-Emile, 307-9
- Miracles de Notre Dame, Les* (Gautier de Coinci), 286
- Montesquieu, 293-96
- Morale à Nicomache* (Aristotle), 146-48
- Morand, Marcel, *Une Irlandaise libérale en France sous la Restauration: Lady Morgan, 1776-1859* (review), 301-2
- Mossner, Ernest Campbell, *The Life of David Hume* (review), 298-99
- Mossner, Ernest C., *see* Klibansky
- Opéra comique*, 3-24
- Opere* (Svevo), 71-72
- Oresme, Nicole, 146-48
- Orlando furioso*, 57-58
- Paribatra, Princess Marsi, *Le Romanisme contemporain: Essai sur l'inquiétude et l'évasion dans les lettres françaises de 1850 à 1950* (review), 155-56
- Park, Julian, *The Culture of France in Our Time* (review), 157-58
- Parménie, A. and C. Bonnier de la Chapelle, *Histoire d'un éditeur et de ses auteurs: P.-J. Hetzel [Stahl]* (review), 52-55
- Pascal, 275-80
- Pattison, Walter T., *Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process* (review), 65-67
- Pelayo, Marcelino Menéndez, *Biblioteca de traductores españoles* (review), 128-31
- Penna, Mario, editor, Alfonso Martínez de Toledo: *Arcepreste de Talavera* (review), 288-90
- Petrarch, 101-7

- Phonology, 306-7
 Port-Royal, 59-60
 Prezzolini, Giuseppe, *Machiavelli Anti-Cristo* (review), 290-91
 Proust, 67-69
 Provençal Literature, 135-38
 Putter, Irving, *The Pessimism of Leconte de Lisle: Sources and Evolution* (review), 236-37
 Renaud, Madeleine, 74-76
 Reyes, Enrique Sánchez, see Rothberg, I. P.
 Reymes, William, translator, Nicolò Secchi: *Self-Interest* (review), 61
 Rimbaud, 192-202, 218-35
 Roche, Alphonse V., *Provençal Regionalism: A study of the Movement in the Revue Félibréenne, Le Feu, and Other Reviews of Southern France* (review), 135-38
 Rolland, Romain, 69-70
 Romanticism, 131-34, 155-57
 Ronsard, 56-57, 292-93
 Rothberg, I. P. (*Biblioteca de traductores españoles*), 128-31
 Rousseau, 250-57
 Ruff, Marcel A., *Baudelaire, l'homme et l'œuvre* (review), 280-85
 ———, *L'Esprit du mal et l'esthétique baudelairienne* (review), 280-85
 Ruggiero, Ortensia, *Marivaux e il suo teatro* (review), 148-49
 Salomon, Pierre, *George Sand* (review), 64-65
 Sánchez, Luis Alberto, *Proceso y contenido de la novela hispano-americana* (review), 151-52
 Sand, George, 64-65
 Secchi, Nicolò, 61
Self-Interest (Secchi), 61
 Sponde, Jean de, 58-59
 Stahl, see Hetzel, P.-J.
 Stylistics, 49-52
 Suarès, André, 69-70
 Sullivan, Edward D., *Maupassant the Novelist* (review), 154-55
 Surrealism, 156-57
 Svevo, Italo, 71-72
 Symbolism, 161-63, 218-35
 Taylor, Pauline, editor, *Gerbert de Mez: Chanson de geste du XII^e siècle* (review), 145-46
 Unamuno, 303-4
 Valéry, 161-63, 203-35
Venjanse Notre Seigneur, La, 286-88
 Verlaine, 223-35
 Voltaire, 63-64, 101-11
 Vossler, Ch., *Langue et Culture de la France* (review), 76
 Wagner, R.-L., *Supplément bibliographique à l'Introduction à la linguistique française, 1947-1953* (review), 304-6
 Wicks, Charles Beaumont, *The Parisian Stage: Alphabetical Indexes of Plays and Authors*. Part I: 1800-1815; part II: 1815-1830 (review), 138-40
 Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, *A History of Italian Literature* (review), 44-48
 Zulime, 108-11



Montaigne's Discovery of Man

DONALD M. FRAME. This portrayal of Montaigne's "meditative journey" through life is an excellent introduction to the man and the thinker and an illuminating guide through the *Essays*. "For an introduction to the thought of that great French writer it is difficult to conceive of a better book." *Los Angeles Times* \$3.50

Voltaire and the State

CONSTANCE ROWE. Voltaire's ideas on government, the state, the nation, and human rights echoed across the Western world and reverberated in two revolutions, the French and the American. From Voltaire's voluminous writings, Dr. Rowe has extracted his theory of statesmanship which she here presents in a penetrating analysis. \$4.00

The Literary Symbol

WILLIAM YORK TINDALL. This ingenious and challenging study by one of our most brilliant and sensitive critics of the place and uses of the symbol in literature attempts to make a "decent compromise" between analysis and impression. \$4.50

Julian Green and the Thorn of Puritanism

SAMUEL E. STOKES, JR. A critical survey of Green's novels and thought up to 1951. Dr. Stokes considers Green's spiritual development and describes the effects of the conflict between his Puritan heritage and the natural instincts in his own life and in his fiction. \$3.00

The Mind of Napoleon

J. CHRISTOPHER HEROLD, editor and translator. A fascinating presentation of Napoleon's ideas and opinions "about everything in heaven and on earth," this book will give the reader a chance to make a personal acquaintance with Napoleon's thought. \$5.00

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK 27